

Public Document Pack



ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE · AUDENSHAW · DENTON · DROYLSDEN · DUKINFIELD · HYDE · LONGDENDALE · MOSSLEY · STALYBRIDGE

EXECUTIVE CABINET

Day: Wednesday
Date: 24 October 2018
Time: 3.00 pm
Place: Lesser Hall 2 - Dukinfield Town Hall

Item No.	AGENDA	Page No
1.	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE To receive any apologies for the meeting from Members of the Executive Cabinet.	
2.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST To receive any declarations of interest from Members of Executive Cabinet.	
3.	MINUTES	
a)	EXECUTIVE CABINET To consider the minutes of the meeting held on 19 th September 2018.	1 - 6
b)	STRATEGIC COMMISSIONING BOARD To consider the minutes of the meeting of the Strategic Commissioning Board held on 19 September 2018.	7 - 10
4.	FINANCE REPORTS	
a)	REVENUE MONITORING (PERIOD 5) To consider the attached report of the Deputy Executive Leader / Director of Finance.	11 - 20
b)	REVIEW OF MEMBERS AND OFFICERS OF INDEMNITY To consider the attached report of the Executive Director (Governance and Resources).	21 - 24
5.	CAPITAL REPORTS	
a)	LED STREET LIGHTING To consider the attached report of the Executive Member (Neighbourhoods) / Assistant Director of Operation and Neighbourhoods.	25 - 36
b)	REPLACEMENT OF CREMATORS AND MERCURY ABATEMENT FILTRATION PLANT To consider the attached report of the Executive Member (Neighbourhoods) /	37 - 48

From: Democratic Services Unit – any further information may be obtained from the reporting officer or from Robert Landon, Head of Democratic Services, to whom any apologies for absence should be notified.

Item No.	AGENDA	Page No
	Assistant Director Operation and Neighbourhoods.	
c)	REPAIR AND RESTORATION OF CEMETERY BOUNDARY WALLS To consider the attached report of the Executive Member (Neighbourhoods) / Assistant Director Operation and Neighbourhoods.	49 - 66
d)	REPLACEMENT OF COUNCIL FLEET VEHICLES To consider the attached report of the Executive Member (Neighbourhoods) / Assistant Director Operation and Neighbourhoods.	67 - 80
e)	ENGINEERING CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2018/19 UPDATE To consider the attached report of the Executive Member for Neighbourhood Services / Director of Operations and Neighbourhoods.	81 - 96
6.	FOR INFORMATION	
a)	CORPORATE PARENTING UPDATE To consider the attached report of the Executive Member (Children's Services) / Assistant Director (Children's Services).	97 - 102
7.	URGENT ITEMS To consider any additional items the Chair is of the opinion shall be dealt with as a matter of urgency.	

From: Democratic Services Unit – any further information may be obtained from the reporting officer or from Robert Landon, Head of Democratic Services, to whom any apologies for absence should be notified.

EXECUTIVE CABINET

19 September 2018

Present: Councillors Warrington (in the Chair),
Councillors Fairfoul, Gwynne, Kitchen, Bray, Feeley and Ryan.

In Attendance:

Steven Pleasant	Chief Executive
Sandra Stewart	Director of Governance & Pensions
Kathy Roe	Director of Finance
Steph Butterworth	Director of Adult's Services
David Moore	Director of Growth
Jeanelle De Gruchy	Director of Population Health
Ian Saxon	Director of Operations & Neighbourhoods
Sandra Whitehead	Assistant Director (Adult Services)
Emma Varnam	Assistant Director (Operations and Neighbourhoods)

Apologies for Absence: Councillor Cooney

22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

23. MINUTES

a) Meeting of Executive Cabinet

Consideration was given to the Minutes of the Meeting of Executive Cabinet held on 29 August 2018

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the Meeting of Executive Cabinet held on 29 August 2018 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

b) Strategic Commissioning Board

Consideration was given to the Minutes of the Strategic Commissioning Board held on 29 August 2018.

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the Strategic Commissioning Board held on 29 August 2018 be received.

c) Carbon and Waste reduction Panel

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the Carbon and Waste Reduction Panel.

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the Strategic Planning and Capital Monitoring Panel held on 6 September 2018 be received.

d) Strategic Planning and Capital Monitoring Panel

Consideration was given to the minutes of the Strategic Planning and Capital Monitoring Panel held on 3 September 2018 and recommended a number of items of consideration and approval by Executive Cabinet.

Members received the recommendations in relation to the Capital Monitoring report for period 4 2018/19 which showed projected capital investment in 2018/19 of £74.798m by March 2019.

Members received the recommendations in relation to the Local Full Fibre Network seeking approval of the development of a bid to DCMS LFFN, which will seek to join together similar open fibre infrastructures across the North of England.

Members received the recommendations in relation to the Asset Management (Capital repair spend on the Council's property) seeking approval of £9718.70, associated with statutory compliance capital repairs for the period June 2018.

Members received the recommendations in relation to the proposed changes to the Education Capital Programme.

RESOLVED

- (i) That the Minutes of the meeting of the Strategic Planning and Capital Monitoring Panel held on 3 September 2018 be received.**
- (ii) That the re-profiling of £16.753m into future year(s) to match expected spending profile and to reflect up to date investment profiles be approved.**
- (iii) That the changes to the Capital Programme as detailed within the submitted report be approved.**
- (iv) The updated Prudential Indicator position as detailed in appendix 5 of the submitted report be approved.**
- (v) That the development of a bid to DCMS LFFN be approved.**
- (vi) The spend of £9718.70, associated with statutory compliance capital repairs for the period June 2018, be approved.**
- (vii) The proposed changes to the Education Capital Programme as outlined in Appendix 1 (Basic Need Funding Schemes) and Appendix 2 (School Condition Allocation Funding Schemes) of the submitted report, be approved.**

18. REVENUE MONITORING REPORT

Consideration was given to a report of the Executive Member (Performance and Finance) / Director Finance providing a consolidated forecast for the Strategic Commission and NHS Tameside and Glossop Integrated Care Foundation Trust (ICFT) for the current financial year.

It was reported that the Strategic Commission is currently forecasting that expenditure for the Integrated Commissioning Fund will exceed budget by £ 4.061 million by the end of 2018/19 due to a combination of non-delivery savings and cost pressures.

It was reported that there is a clear urgency to implement associated strategies to ensure the projected funding gap in the current financial year is addressed and closed on a recurrent basis across the whole economy. The Medium Term Financial Plan for the period 2019/20 to 2023/24 identifies significant savings requirements for future years. If budget pressures in service areas in 2018/19 are sustained, this will inevitably lead to an increase in the level of savings required in future years to balance the budget.

Following the liquidation of Carillion the appointed liquidator Price Waterhouse Cooper (PwC) has been managing the contracts to enable the smooth transfer to other providers. The costs of this

service were not budgeted for, and will continue to be incurred until everything is finalised. PwC are charging a weekly management fee which, has increased significantly since period 2, and this was reflected in the deterioration of the forecast to a cost pressure of £0.9m.

Executive Cabinet were informed that the Strategic Commissioning Board had previously considered the report and supported the recommendations.

No alternatives were considered as not reporting on financial performance could put at risk the achievement of the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan. Effective budget management was critical to ensuring that financial resources were spent in line with the agreed budgets.

RESOLVED

- (i) That the significant level of savings required during 2018/19 to deliver a balanced recurrent economy budget together with the related risks which, are contributing to the overall adverse forecast, be noted.**
- (ii) That the significant cost pressures facing the Strategic Commission, particularly in respect of Continuing Healthcare, Children's Social Care and Growth, be noted.**
- (iii) That officers work to identify and action offsetting savings and efficiencies to bring the budget back into balance.**
- (iv) That it be noted the Strategic Commissioning Board (SCB) has been asked to authorise the use of headroom in the ICF risk share to increase the CCG surplus in 2018/19. This will enable drawdown of cumulative surplus in 2019/20 and improve the future financial position.**

19. COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME

Consideration was given to a report of the Deputy Executive Leader/ Assistant Director (Exchequer Services), which set out the procedural requirement for deciding if changes were required to the Council Tax Support scheme to become effective from April 2019. The Welfare Reform Act 2012 abolished Council Tax Benefit from 31 March 2013 and all Local Authorities, including Tameside Council, were required to design and run their own scheme with less money available due to cuts by national government. Tameside's Council Tax Support Scheme (CTS) was introduced from 1 April 2013. The scheme still provides financial assistance to some Council Tax charge payers on a low income whether they rent or own their home, or live rent-free. The effect of receiving Council Tax Support is a reduction in the amount of Council Tax they have to pay.

It was explained that overall scheme costs and claimant numbers had continued to decline and support for claimants remained in place. It was stated that there appeared to be no adverse equality impact arising from the quarterly reviews that took place and further guidance, which may have a bearing on the scheme, from the Department for Communities and Local Government was not expected.

Executive Cabinet were requested to approve the undertaking of a consultation exercise in accordance with the scheme setting procedural requirements to amend the CTS to include:

- Proposal A - Award a 2 week run on for claimants moving from benefit into work
- Proposal B - Apply an earnings disregard to self-employed claimants

Members were informed that consideration had been given to the effects of Universal Credit as the Council Tax Support scheme is based on Universal Credit guidelines therefore, it is important that the scheme aligns where possible. Awarding a 2 week run on for claimants moving from Housing Benefit to Universal Credit had been introduced into the Universal Credit scheme from 11 April 2018. Awarding an additional 2 weeks CTS to any working age claimant that starts work after being in receipt of what is known as a 'passport' benefit such as Job Seekers Allowance or Income Support adheres to CTS scheme guidance to provide a work incentive. If implemented this is estimated to affect no more than 25 working age claimants per week and cost £41k based on current Council Tax levels.

It was reported to mitigate the impact on the most vulnerable, funding will be set aside to continue to support a local discretionary scheme. This money could be available to award discretionary payments to support people who are suffering severe financial hardship as a result of the changes to the Council Tax Support Scheme.

Consulting on the Council Tax Support Scheme was a statutory requirement and therefore no alternatives were considered. Members could choose to propose alternative measures however, this must be considered as part of the overall budget setting process and the legal requirement to set a balanced budget.

RESOLVED

- (i) That the Council Tax Support Scheme be recommended to be amended to include the award a 2 week run on for claimants moving from benefit into work and the application an earnings disregard to self-employed claimants.**
- (i) That a public consultation exercise on the proposed changes to the Scheme be undertaken between 19 September 2018 and 22 November 2018,**
- (ii) A report be brought to the Executive Cabinet meeting to be held on 12 December 2018 advising of the result of the consultation exercise.**

20. BANDING PAYMENT SYSTEM AND AGE POLICY CHANGE FOR SHARED LIVES PLACEMENTS

Consideration was given to a report of the Executive Leader / Director of Adult Services which sought permission to introduce a banding payment system for Shared Lives carers to reflect the complexity of need of those cared for, and also change the age of entry into Shared Lives from 18 years of age to 16 years of age to improve transition and continuity of care for young people.

The Shared Lives Scheme is regulated under Health and Social Care Act 2008 and The Care Act 2014, which now provides a single legal framework for charging for care and support under sections 14 and 17 supplemented by The Care and Support (Charging and Assessment of Resources) Regulations 2014.

It was reported that the proposed banding payment system for Shared Lives carers, ensures the payment made to carers is reflective of the levels of need of the service users in their care, and providing a choice to carers of the amount of assistance they want to, or can, provide at a certain cost. The proposed new framework is intended to make charging fairer and more clearly understood by everyone.

Consultation on the proposals had been undertaken by Shared Lives staff and managers, supported by Policy and Communications Team. Thirty people had responded to the consultation with twenty of those responding to the banding element of the proposal. Overall the majority felt the proposals would make the system fairer and more equitable for carers.

Members considered the alternative options of retaining the existing system but this was discounted on the grounds that this would not improve access to Shared Lives for people with more complex needs and young people coming through transition.

RESOLVED

- (i) That the introduction of a new banding payment system for Shared Lives carers, be approved.**
- (ii) That the age of entry to Shared Lives be changed from 18 to 16 years in the Shared Lives Policy.**
- (iii) That the existing Shared Lives arrangements be protected if the banding for an existing service user is assessed as being Band 1.**
- (iv) That the new a banding system be implemented by 1 April 2019.**

(v) Where an emergency placement is made that this initially be paid at the higher rate until an assessment is completed.

21. OFSTED INSPECTION UPDATE

Consideration was given to a report of the Executive Member for Children and Families / Director of Children's Services updating Executive Cabinet on the findings of the sixth Ofsted monitoring visit which was undertaken between 22nd and 23rd August 2018.

It was reported by Ofsted that in too many areas of the service for children looked after; the pace of progress has been slow. The quality of social work practice, supervision and management oversight, and challenge by independent reviewing officers (IROs) still require significant improvement to ensure that practice improves and delivers good outcomes for children looked after. Inspectors found some evidence of improving performance in the timeliness of statutory requirements, such as reviews, completion of health assessments and personal education plans.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

This page is intentionally left blank

TAMESIDE AND GLOSSOP STRATEGIC COMMISSIONING BOARD

19 September 2018

Commenced: 1.00 pm

Terminated: 2.05 pm

Present: Dr Alan Dow (Chair) - NHS Tameside and Glossop CCG
Steven Pleasant - Tameside MBC Chief Executive and Accountable
Officer for NHS Tameside and Glossop CCG
Councillor Warrington - Tameside MBC
Councillor Fairfoull - Tameside MBC
Councillor Bray - Tameside MBC
Councillor Feeley - Tameside MBC
Councillor Gwynne - Tameside MBC
Councillor Ryan - Tameside MBC
Dr Vinny Khunger - NHS Tameside and Glossop CCG
Dr Alison Lea - NHS Tameside and Glossop CCG
Dr Ashwin Ramachandra - NHS Tameside and Glossop CCG
Carol Prowse - NHS Tameside and Glossop CCG

In Attendance:

Jeanelle De Gruchy	Director of Population Health
Kathy Roe	Director of Finance
Sandra Stewart	Director of Governance and Pensions
Sandra Whitehead	Assistant Director (Adults)
Elaine Richardson	Head of Assurance and Delivery
Simon Brunet	Policy Manager

Apologies for Absence: Councillor Cooney - Tameside MBC
Councillor Wharmby - Derbyshire CC
Dr Jamie Douglas - NHS Tameside and Glossop CCG

48. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

49. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

That the Minutes of the previous meeting held on 29 August 2018 were approved as a correct record.

50. FINANCIAL CONTEXT

a) Financial Position of the Integrated Commissioning Fund

Consideration was given to a report of the Director of Finance providing an overview on the financial position of the Tameside and Glossop economy in 2018/19 at 31 July 2018 with a forecast projection to 31 March 2019 including the details of the Integrated Commissioning Fund for all Council services and the Clinical Commissioning Group with a total net revenue budget value for 2018/19 of £581 million.

The Commission was currently forecasting that expenditure for the Integrated Commissioning Fund would exceed budget by £5.84 million by the end of 2018/19 due to a combination of non-delivery

savings and cost pressures in some areas, particularly in respect of Continuing Healthcare, Children's Social Care and the Growth directorate. Supporting details of the projected variances were explained, as outlined in Appendix 1 to the report. The excess was offset slightly by savings in other areas, such as the success of the GP Prescribing Costs scheme, a dividend from investment in Manchester Airport and lower than expected borrowing.

In particular the Director of Finance explained that the Clinical Commissioning Group was planning to deliver a surplus of £9.347 million broken down into two parts:-

- £3.668 million mandated 1% surplus; and
- £5.679 million cumulative surplus brought forward from previous years.

The 1% in year surplus was a requirement of business rules and the cumulative surplus brought forward was built up in 2016/17 and 2017/18 when Clinical Commissioning Groups had to contribute to national risk reserves offsetting overspend in the provider sector. There was no national risk reserve in 2018/19 but there was still a significant financial gap nationally, which needed to be addressed. Whilst the cumulative surplus brought forward remained on the Clinical Commissioning Group's balance sheet, there was currently no mechanism through which Tameside and Glossop were able to drawdown or use any of this resource.

However, there were emerging proposals that could potentially allow Clinical Commissioning Groups who were able to increase their 2018/19 surplus to drawdown some of their cumulative surplus in 2019/20. Where a Clinical Commissioning Group agreed to underspend its allocation in a year they would receive a guaranteed surplus drawdown the following year on a two for one basis, subject to the cumulative surplus being available. A draft proposal detailed in the report had been circulated to Clinical Commissioning Groups across Greater Manchester and discussed at the Finance and QIPP Assurance Group in August, where it was suggested to use headroom in the Integrated Care Fund risk share to increase the 2018/19 Clinical Commissioning Group surplus up to £3 million. This would enable a potential drawdown of £6 million in 2019/20, reducing the cumulative surplus and improving the financial position of the integrated commissioner on a recurrent basis. The Director of Finance agreed to keep the Board advised of developments.

RESOLVED

- (i) That the significant level of savings required during 2018/19 to deliver a balanced recurrent economy budget together with the related risks, which were contributing to the overall adverse forecast, be acknowledged.**
- (ii) That the significant cost pressures facing the Strategic Commission, particularly in respect of Continuing Healthcare, Children's Social Care and Growth, be acknowledged.**
- (iii) That the use of headroom in the Integrated Care Fund risk share to increase the Clinical Commissioning Group surplus in 2018/19 to enable drawdown of cumulative surplus in 2019/20 be authorised.**

51. COMMISSIONING FOR REFORM

a) Banding Payment System and Age Policy Change for Shared Lives Placements

Consideration was given to a report of the Executive Leader and Assistant Director (Adult Services). The report was seeking permission to introduce a banding payment system for Shared Lives carers to reflect the complexity of need of those cared for, and also change the age of entry into Shared Lives from 18 years of age to 16 years of age to improve transition and continuity of care for young people. This was part of a wider transformation plan focused on improving access to Shared Lives for people with more complex needs and young people coming through transition.

The Council faced significant budgetary challenges over the foreseeable future, which meant it must diversify service delivery by looking at new and innovative approaches to deliver better outcomes

whilst also reducing the cost of provision. This could also include a cost benefit analysis across the health and social care system identifying where efficiencies can be made.

Shared Lives supported some of the most vulnerable individuals across the borough to maximise their independence through a family based community support network. Throughout the service offer Shared Lives carers could support service users to maintain independence in the community and as a support to family carers to maintain their roles. As people progressed into long term placements Shared Lives carers offered an asset based approach as a less costly alternative to traditional services. The Shared Lives Scheme was currently in a period of transformation to expand the provision to a more diverse range of Service Users and relieve pressure on other provisions. Recruitment of skilled carers was pivotal to these aims.

The proposed banding payment system for Shared Lives carers ensured the payment made to carers was reflective of the levels of need of the service users in their care, and providing a choice to carers of the amount of assistance they wanted to, or could, provide at a certain cost.

A banding payment system would also support the attraction of a larger number of prospective carers to meet the varying degrees of need. There was a need to review the fixed payments that were currently offered to carers and consider a payment mechanism that was more reflective of the complexity of service users that carers currently supported, and could support in the future as services were expanded. It would also support recruiting more carers to the service. Some individuals might be willing to provide accommodation but not much support while others might be willing and want to provide a substantial amount of support on the basis that the level of support and commitment was financially recognised. Some kind of differential pay system segments the market and should have the effect of attracting a larger number of carers to the role.

By changing the age of access to 16 years this allowed a wider range of young people to consider Shared Lives as a viable alternative to other support approaches. This would include Looked After Children and also young people with complex needs who were currently in placements or with Foster carers. Foster carers who cared for young people with complex needs would, in the interests of continuity, be encouraged to become Shared Lives carers. As the young person became an adult the banding system would offer a more comparable payment system reflecting the complexity of need that a fixed rate system did not recognise.

The aim was to expand the Shared Lives offer to provide more person centred care as an alternative to other high cost alternatives such as placements in supported housing or out of area placements.

All service users would be reviewed against the proposed banding scheme that would be implemented by 1 April 2019 and existing Shared Lives carers payments would be protected if the banding for an existing service user was assessed at a lower rate than their existing payment for the duration that they were caring for that individual.

It was proposed that in an emergency carers would receive the higher banding rate until the banding assessment had been completed. If the person's banding was lowered carers would not be expected to refund the difference. The decision of which band would be applicable to the service user would be agreed between the Shared Lives Social Worker and the Care Coordinator who had assessed the needs of the individual.

RESOLVED

- (i) That a new banding payment system for Shared Lives carers be introduced.**
- (ii) That the age of entry to Shared Lives be changed from 18 to 16 years in the Shared Lives Policy.**
- (iii) That existing Shared Lives arrangements be protected if the banding for an existing service user was assessed as being Band 1.**
- (iv) That the banding system be implemented by 1 April 2019.**
- (v) That where an emergency place was made this would initially be paid at the higher rate until an assessment was completed.**

b) NHS England Consultation on Evidence Based Interventions: GM Response

The Interim Director of Commissioning presented a report summarising the NHS England consultation on evidence based interventions and proposed a Greater Manchester response that would be submitted on behalf of Tameside and Glossop and other Greater Manchester Clinical Commissioning Groups.

It was stated that the NHS England proposal was to stop routinely funding four category one interventions and set qualifying criteria for a further thirteen category two interventions, which were detailed in the report. Greater Manchester had policies for three of the four category one interventions with a local policy for the fourth and policies for 12 of the 13 category two interventions with stricter criteria than what was being proposed by NHS England. It was confirmed that Tameside and Glossop was not in the top 50 Clinical Commissioning Groups for spend in this area and Tameside and Glossop Integrated Care Foundation Trust was not one of the top 50 providers for activity in this area.

The interventions would not be routinely offered to NHS funded patients or offered only if specific criteria applied. However, clinicians would be able to apply for funding for category one interventions if they could demonstrate exceptionality and for prior approval for all category two interventions. The expectation was that the GP would apply for funding rather than the provider clinician.

Category one interventions would be removed from the scope of National Tariff price or a national variation would be used so that providers were not paid for activity unless they had an individual funding request number. The proposal was that this would apply from April 2019.

With effect from 1 April 2019 the NHS Standard Contract would be amended to mandate compliance with the Evidence-Based Interventions policy. The proposed additions to the Contract would require both commissioners and providers to comply with the Evidence-Based Interventions policy and enable the commissioner to withhold payment for the relevant procedure where the provider treats a patient without evidence of individual funding request approval (category one) or other prior approval (category two).

NHS England proposed aligning the e-referral system with the new programme by excluding category one interventions from the e-referral system except where an individual funding request has been agreed. They intended to work with Clinical Commissioning Groups and GPs on how best to implement this.

The proposed Greater Manchester response to the NHS England consultation on Evidence Based Interventions, as outlined in section 6 of the report, was discussed with the Board.

RESOLVED

- (i) That the report and implications be noted.**
- (ii) That the response to NHS England as set out in section 6 of the report be agreed.**

52. URGENT ITEMS

The Chair reported that there were no urgent items for consideration at this meeting.

53. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the next meeting of the Strategic Commissioning Board would take place on Wednesday 24 October 2018.

CHAIR

Report to:	EXECUTIVE CABINET
Date:	24 October 2018
Executive Member/ Reporting Officer	Cllr Fairfoull – Deputy Executive Leader Kathy Roe – Director of Finance Tom Wilkinson – Assistant Director of Finance
Subject:	STRATEGIC COMMISSION AND NHS TAMESIDE AND GLOSSOP INTEGRATED CARE FOUNDATION TRUST – CONSOLIDATED 2018/19 REVENUE MONITORING STATEMENT AT 31 AUGUST 2018 AND FORECAST TO 31 MARCH 2019
Report Summary:	<p>This report has been prepared jointly by officers of Tameside Council, NHS Tameside and Glossop Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS Tameside and Glossop Integrated Care Foundation Trust (ICFT).</p> <p>The report provides a consolidated forecast for the Strategic Commission and ICFT for the current financial year. Supporting details for the whole economy are provided in Appendix 1.</p> <p>The Strategic Commission is currently forecasting that expenditure for the Integrated Commissioning Fund will exceed budget by £3.916 million by the end of 2018/19 due to a combination of non-delivery savings and cost pressures in some areas.</p>
Recommendations:	<p>Members are recommended to :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Acknowledge the significant level of savings required during 2018/19 to deliver a balanced recurrent economy budget together with the related risks which are contributing to the overall adverse forecast.2. Acknowledge the significant cost pressures facing the Strategic Commission, particularly in respect of Continuing Healthcare, Children’s Social Care and Growth.
Links to Community Strategy:	Budget is allocated in accordance with the Community Strategy.
Policy Implications:	Budget is allocated in accordance with Council Policy.
Financial Implications: (Authorised by the statutory Section 151 Officer & Chief Finance Officer)	<p>This report provides the 2018/19 consolidated financial position statement at 31 August 2018 for the Strategic Commission and ICFT partner organisations. For the year to 31 March 2019 the report forecasts that service expenditure will exceed the approved budget in a number of areas, due to a combination of cost pressures and non-delivery of savings. These pressures are being partially offset by additional income in corporate and contingency which may not be available in future years.</p> <p>The report emphasises that there is a clear urgency to implement associated strategies to ensure the projected funding gap in the current financial year is addressed and closed on a recurrent basis across the whole economy. The Medium Term Financial Plan for the period 2019/20 to 2023/24 identifies significant savings requirements for future years. If budget pressures in</p>

service areas in 2018/19 are sustained, this will inevitably lead to an increase in the level of savings required in future years to balance the budget.

It should be noted that the Integrated Commissioning Fund (ICF) for the Strategic Commission is bound by the terms within the Section 75 and associated Financial Framework agreements.

Legal Implications:
(Authorised by the Borough Solicitor)

The Council and CCG want to work together in a collective and integrated way to maximise vfm and create the most efficient and effective service delivery and best outcomes for residents. This is important to avoid a saving achieved by one organisation becoming a cost for the other. However, it is constrained by the separate legal and financial frameworks in which it works. Whilst this should not be a reason or justification for not delivering or working jointly in order to ensure it meets its legal and regulatory compliance requirements and avoid expensive legal /reputational challenge/risk we must be very clear on what basis we are spending any budget and on whose authority and there must be clear governance to demonstrate this. Accordingly, we need to ensure we have aligned and agreed accountancy rules and principles and we clearly show where the accountability and governance for such spend. This is particularly important given the joint/shared Chief Executives/accountable officer role and the finance/s151 officer to ensure any conflicts are addressed transparently and there is a clear record and we are able to demonstrate vfm.

Risk Management:

Associated details are specified within the presentation.

Failure to properly manage and monitor the Strategic Commission's budgets will lead to service failure and a loss of public confidence. Expenditure in excess of budgeted resources is likely to result in a call on Council reserves, which will reduce the resources available for future investment. The use and reliance on one off measures to balance the budget is not sustainable and makes it more difficult in future years to recover the budget position.

Access to Information :


Background papers relating to this report can be inspected by contacting :


Tom Wilkinson, Assistant Director of Finance, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council

 Telephone:0161 342 5609


 e-mail: tom.wilkinson@tameside.gov.uk

Tracey Simpson, Deputy Chief Finance Officer, Tameside and Glossop Clinical Commissioning Group

 Telephone:0161 342 5626

 e-mail: tracey.simpson@nhs.net

David Warhurst, Associate Director Of Finance, Tameside and Glossop Integrated Care NHS Foundation Trust

 Telephone:0161 922 4624

 e-mail: David.Warhurst@tgh.nhs.uk

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report aims to provide an overview on the financial position of the Tameside and Glossop economy in 2018/19 at the 31 August 2018 with a forecast projection to 31 March 2019. Supporting details for the whole economy are provided in **Appendix 1**.
- 1.2 The report includes the details of the Integrated Commissioning Fund (ICF) for all Council services and the Clinical Commissioning Group. The total net revenue budget value of the ICF for 2018/19 is currently £582.220 million.
- 1.3 It should be noted that the report also includes details of the financial position of the Tameside and Glossop Integrated Care NHS Foundation Trust. This is to ensure members have an awareness of the overall Tameside and Glossop economy position. Reference to Glossop solely relates to health service expenditure as Council services for Glossop are the responsibility of Derbyshire County Council.
- 1.4 Please note that any reference throughout this report to the Tameside and Glossop economy refers to the three partner organisations namely:
- Tameside and Glossop Integrated Care NHS Foundation Trust (ICFT)
 - NHS Tameside and Glossop CCG (CCG)
 - Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council (TMBC)
- 1.5 This period there continues to be a focus on delivery of current Targeted Efficiency Programme (TEP) programmes as well as the challenge of delivering future TEP plans enabling the economy to close the financial gap. These challenges were presented to the Board to Board to Board meeting on 11 September 2018 comprised of the Integrated Care Foundation Trust (ICFT) and the Strategic Commission members.
- 1.6 Across the economy there is a “Do Nothing” financial gap of £124m by 2022/23. Plans are in place which will deliver expected savings of £57m, but even in this ‘do something’ scenario there is still a financial gap of £67m to close.
- 1.7 To start to address this gap the Strategic Commission has generated 114 savings proposals. Of these ideas 56 have a value totalling £8.42m that are expected to go towards closing the gap.
- 1.8 The remainder of the schemes need to be developed further including some larger schemes focusing on End of Life / Palliative Care and Frailty to understand the potential savings behind these. The economy has access to 20 days consultancy from NHS England’s Quality Innovation Product Prevention (QIPP) 4 programme and it is important we direct this resource optimally.
- 1.9 All the savings ideas will be presented at the Star Chambers taking place in October 2018 where the detail of the schemes will be reviewed and viable schemes will be taken forward to help deliver the savings required.
- 1.10 In addition to the future saving plans, there continues to be challenges in the economy that require attention to achieve the financial position in 2018/19. On-going work is taking place to address these areas as part of the in-year TEP efforts.

2. FINANCIAL SUMMARY

- 2.1 Table 1 provides details of the summary 2018/19 budgets and net expenditure for the ICF and Tameside and Glossop Integrated Care NHS Foundation Trust (ICFT) projected to 31 March 2019. The Strategic Commission is currently forecasting that expenditure for the

Integrated Commissioning Fund will exceed budget by £3.916m by the end of 2018/19 due to a combination of non-delivery savings and cost pressures in some areas.

Table 1: Summary of the ICF and ICFT – 2018/19

Organisation	Net Budget £000s	Forecast £000s	Variance £000s	Previous Month Variance	Movement in Month
Strategic Commission (ICF)	582,220	586,136	(3,916)	(4,061)	145
ICFT	(19,149)	(19,149)	0	0	0
Total	563,071	566,987	(3,916)	(4,061)	145

- 2.2 The Strategic Commission risk share arrangements remain in place for 2018/19. Under this arrangement the Council has agreed to increase its contribution to the ICF by up to £5.0m in 2018/19 in support of the CCG's QIPP savings target. There is a reciprocal arrangement where the CCG will increase its contribution to the ICF in 2020/21.
- 2.3 Any variation beyond is shared in the ratio 68 : 32 for CCG : Council. A cap is placed on the shared financial exposure for each organisation (after the use of £5.0m) in 2018/19 which is a maximum £0.5m contribution from the CCG towards the Council year end position and a maximum of £2.0m contribution from the Council towards the CCG year end position. The CCG year end position is adjusted prior to this contribution for costs relating to the residents of Glossop (13% of the total CCG variance) as the Council has no legal powers to contribute to such expenditure.
- 2.4 A summary of the financial position of the ICF analysed by service is provided in **Appendix 1**. The projected variances arise due to both savings that are projected not to be realised and emerging cost pressures in 2018/19. Further narrative on key variances is summarised in sections 3 and 4.

3. STRATEGIC COMMISSIONER FINANCIAL POSITION

Acute Services

- 3.1 The overall forecast position for acute services is £0.6m. This is an increase of £0.4m from last month. The key driver in contract performance remains with Manchester FT (MFT). The forecast for MFT is now £1.4m over plan and is a continuation in demand within the urgent care pathway and the increasing risk associated with Referral to Treatment (RTT) trajectories.
- 3.2 Underspends continue at Stockport Foundation Trust (FT), which is largely due to maternity and the number of strokes. The other area is within planned care for cardiology, which is due to the decommissioning of this service in April 18 which transferred to Wythenshawe hospital and is referenced within the MFT deep dive. The number of births in the first 4 months of 2018/19 is lower when compared against last year.
- 3.3 Pennine Acute and Salford FT contract performance continues to come down and in particular Pain Management at Salford as patients are put on either a 16 or 30 consecutive session programme. Salford FT have confirmed that there is unlikely to be any further T&G patients on the programme until the end of the financial year which has reduced our forecast.
- 3.4 Independent sector forecast has increased by £0.1m this month as we start to see an increase in nerve conduction studies, MRI scans and termination of pregnancy. Other changes include the shift in activity away from SpaMedica and into GM Primary Eye Care, and the decrease in activity at Care UK / InHealth for Dexa scans, which is transferred to NHS providers as part of the CCGs commissioning intention.

Mental Health

- 3.5 An additional £2.5m of recurrent investment was agreed in 2018/19 in order to meet requirements of the Five Year Forward View. While this recurrent commitment remains in place, there is likely to be some non-recurrent slippage against this which can count towards TEP this year.
- 3.6 Budgets included an expectation that 5 specialist MH placements would be required. There have been 2 new admissions this month which, based on average lengths of stay, has created a £0.1m pressure.
- 3.7 The position this month also includes £0.2m for Mental Health beds at Pennine Care. This creates additional capacity and has been agreed across all Pennine commissioners. Both the specialist placements and MH beds are contained within the additional £2.5m investment and do not impact upon expected slippage forecast within TEP.

Primary Care

- 3.8 Category M Drugs (Cat M) price increases of £15m per month have been agreed at a national level from August. Prices expected to change again from October, but unclear what the impact of this will be. Estimated price increase will cost the CCG around £0.1m per month for as long as the prices remain at new rates. Current position assumes pressure will persist until March.
- 3.9 Significant progress against TEP, particularly for repeat ordering protocols means the Cat M pressure has been contained and we have actually increased expected achievement at M5.

Continuing Care

- 3.10 Growth in the cost and volume of individualised packages of care is amongst the biggest financial risks facing the Strategic Commission. Expenditure growth in this area was 14% in 2017/18, with similar double digit growth rates seen over the previous two years. When benchmarked against other CCGs in GM on a per capita basis spend in Tameside & Glossop spends significantly more than average in this area. A continuation of historic growth rates is not financially sustainable and should not be inevitable that the CCG is an outlier against our peers across GM in the cost of individualised commissioning. Therefore budgets which are reflective of this and assume efficiency savings have been set for 2018/19.
- 3.11 A financial recovery plan is now in place and progress against this is reported to the Finance and QIPP Assurance Group on a regular basis.
- 3.12 Further work is required to develop and realise the savings associated with these schemes. However there is clear evidence that progress is being made on fast track placements where marked reductions in both the number of active packages and the duration of each package can be seen.

CCG Other

- 3.13 Services within this directorate such as BCF, estates, safeguarding and patient transport are spending broadly in line with budget and do not present a risk to the CCG position. We have received £1.6m of the approved £6.3m transformation funding so far this year. Allocations for the remainder will be transacted later in the year and we have plans in place to spend. The significant favourable variance has been calculated in order to balance the CCG position and can only be delivered if the CCG is able to fully achieve the £19.8m Targeted Efficiency Plan (TEP) target.

CCG TEP Shortfall

- 3.14 The CCG has a TEP target (also known as the QIPP), of £19.8m for 2018/19. Against this target, £9.626m (49%) of the required savings have been achieved in the first four months of the year. A further £6.592m is rated green and will be realised in future months. After the

application of optimism bias, anticipated further savings of £2.014m from schemes currently rated as amber or red, reducing the net gap to £1.568m

Children's Services

- 3.15 As reported in previous months, Children's Social Care continues to face significant financial pressure due to unprecedented levels of service demand. Despite significant financial investment, the forecast outturn remains at almost £3.1m in excess of the approved budget. A detailed review is to take place in month 6.

Growth Directorate

- 3.16 The service continues to face pressures due to non-delivery of savings and additional cost pressures.
- 3.17 Following the liquidation of Carillion the appointed liquidator PwC has been managing the contracts to enable the smooth transfer to other providers. This transfer took place on 31 July 2017 but significant costs were incurred up to this date, which were not included in the budget.
- 3.18 Significant pressures are also being experienced in relation to loss of income due to the sale of assets and utilisation of assets for Council purposes, income from advertising and income from Building Control and Development Control is currently forecast to be less than budget.
- 3.19 Non delivery of savings is also creating further pressures. The additional Services contract with the Local Education Partnership (LEP) was due to end at the end of October 2018, it was anticipated that savings as a result of a new provision would be achievable. As a result of the collapse of Carillion the existing contract with the LEP has been extended until July 2019 to enable a full review of the Service. Savings anticipated will therefore not materialise in 2018/19. In addition, the purchase of the Plantation Industrial Estate is no longer proceeding and the anticipated additional income will not be realised.

Operations and Neighbourhoods

- 3.20 The forecast outturn position has improved slightly due to staffing posts remaining vacant, however the service continues to forecast an overspend of £0.4m due to non-delivery of savings (relating to additional car parking income) and cost pressures.

Capital Financing, Contingency and Corporate Costs

- 3.21 The 2018/19 budget assumed some of the prior year capital expenditure would be financed from borrowing and that additional borrowing would be required. Continued use of reserves and capital receipts to finance capital expenditure has meant that this borrowing is not yet required and interest charges in 2018/19 will be lower than budget.
- 3.22 Interest earned to date on cash investments is higher than budget due to an increase in the average rate of interest being achieved. This is due to a combination of increase rates overall and a more proactive investment strategy, together with the new investment in Manchester Airport.

4 INTEGRATED CARE FOUNDATION TRUST FINANCIAL POSITION

Control Total

- 4.1 The Trust now has an agreed control for 2018/19 of £19.149m, this assumes the Trust will be in receipt of the full Provider Sustainability Fund (PSF) and deliver the performance and financial requirements set by NHS Improvement (NHSI). Please refer to **Appendix 3**.

Provider Sustainability Fund

- 4.2 The Trust must achieve its financial plan at the end of each quarter to achieve 70% of the PSF, the remainder is predicated on achievement of the A&E target for each quarter based on the improvement trajectories stated by NHSI.

TEP

- 4.3 The Trust is currently forecasting an underachievement against its in year TEP delivery of c£1.5m and recurrently of c£1.8m. Failure to achieve TEP will result in the Trust not achieving its plan. Work is on-going with Theme groups to develop high risk schemes and generate hopper ideas to improve this forecast position.

Loan Liability

- 4.4 The Trust had a loan of £75.4m at the end of 2017/18. The Trust may be required to repay part of this liability in 2018. To do this the Trust would require a new loan, now the Trust has agreed a control total this now would be at the standard borrowing rate of 1.5%.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1 As stated on the report cover.

Appendix 1

Strategic Commission	YTD Position		
Forecast Position £000's	Budget	Actual	Variance
Acute	84,169	84,810	-641
Mental Health	13,307	13,315	-8
Primary Care	33,966	33,874	91
Continuing Care	5,690	6,832	-1,141
Community	12,490	12,493	-3
Other CCG	13,443	11,747	1,696
CCG TEP Shortfall (QIPP)	0	0	0
CCG Running Costs	1,640	1,634	6
Adults	20,972	21,237	-265
Children's Services	24,554	25,870	-1,316
Population Health	11,428	11,443	-15
Operations and Neighbourhoods	20,991	21,456	-465
Growth	3,576	4,589	-1,013
Governance	2,675	2,633	42
Finance & IT	1,870	1,698	173
Quality and Safeguarding	28	52	-24
Capital and Financing	0	0	0
Contingency	-1,108	-502	-606
Corporate Costs	779	-1,972	2,751
Integrated Commissioning Fund	250,470	251,209	-739

Forecast Position		
Budget	Forecast	Variance
204,827	205,441	-613
32,371	32,477	-107
84,604	84,575	29
14,474	17,390	-2,915
29,977	30,282	-305
24,243	20,332	3,911
0	1,546	-1,546
5,209	5,209	0
40,492	40,514	-22
49,330	52,403	-3,074
16,232	16,192	41
50,379	50,792	-413
7,858	10,091	-2,233
8,819	8,819	0
4,488	4,602	-113
67	73	-6
9,638	8,236	1,402
-2,660	-3,388	728
1,870	550	1,320
582,220	586,136	-3,916

Variance	
Previous Month	Movement in Month
-238	-376
-103	-3
75	-46
-2,937	22
-4	-301
3,207	704
-1,546	0
0	0
-15	-7
-3,074	0
35	5
-545	132
-2,247	14
0	0
-113	0
-6	0
1,402	0
728	0
1,320	0
-4,061	145

CCG Expenditure	164,705	164,705	0
TMBC Expenditure	85,765	86,504	-739
Integrated Commissioning Fund	250,470	251,209	-739

395,706	397,252	-1,546
186,514	188,884	-2,370
582,220	586,136	-3,916

-1,546	0
-2,515	145
-4,061	145

A: Section 75 Services	114,063	114,578	-515
B: Aligned Services	104,357	104,504	-147
C: In Collaboration Services	32,050	32,128	-78
Integrated Commissioning Fund	250,470	251,209	-739

266,780	269,185	-2,406
241,684	242,501	-817
73,756	74,449	-693
582,220	586,136	-3,916

-2,522	116
-981	164
-558	-135
-4,061	145

Strategic Commission	Forecast Position					Net Variance	
Forecast Position £000's	Expenditure Budget	Income Budget	Net Budget	Net Forecast	Net Variance	Previous Month	Movement in Month
Acute	204,827	0	204,827	205,441	-613	-238	-376
Mental Health	32,371	0	32,371	32,477	-107	-103	-3
Primary Care	84,604	0	84,604	84,575	29	75	-46
Continuing Care	14,474	0	14,474	17,390	-2,915	-2,937	22
Community	29,977	0	29,977	30,282	-305	-4	-301
Other CCG	24,243	0	24,243	20,332	3,911	3,207	704
CCG TEP Shortfall (QIPP)	0	0	0	1,546	-1,546	-1,546	0
CCG Running Costs	5,209	0	5,209	5,209	0	0	0
Adults	82,590	-42,098	40,492	40,514	-22	-15	-7
Children's Services	78,334	-29,005	49,330	52,403	-3,074	-3,074	0
Individual Schools Budgets	127,944	-127,944	0	0	0	0	0
Population Health	16,353	-121	16,232	16,192	41	35	5
Operations and Neighbourhoods	76,400	-26,021	50,379	50,792	-413	-545	132
Growth	42,669	-34,810	7,858	10,091	-2,233	-2,247	14
Governance	88,701	-79,882	8,819	8,819	0	0	0
Finance & IT	5,898	-1,410	4,488	4,602	-113	-113	0
Quality and Safeguarding	355	-288	67	73	-6	-6	0
Capital and Financing	10,998	-1,360	9,638	8,236	1,402	1,402	0
Contingency	4,163	-6,823	-2,660	-3,388	728	728	0
Corporate Costs	8,726	-6,857	1,870	550	1,320	1,320	0
Integrated Commissioning Fund	938,838	-356,618	582,220	586,136	-3,916	-4,061	145

CCG Expenditure	395,706	0	395,706	397,252	-1,546	-1,546	0
TMBC Expenditure	543,132	-356,618	186,514	188,884	-2,370	-2,515	145
Integrated Commissioning Fund	938,838	-356,618	582,220	586,136	-3,916	-4,061	145

A: Section 75 Services	306,932	-40,844	266,089	269,185	-3,097	-2,522	-575
B: Aligned Services	336,984	-96,115	240,869	242,708	-1,839	-981	-858
C: In Collaboration Services	294,923	-219,662	75,262	74,242	1,020	-558	1,578
Integrated Commissioning Fund	938,839	-356,619	582,220	586,136	-3,916	-4,061	145

Integrated Care Foundation Trust							
Financial performance metric	Plan M5 (£000)	Actual M5 (£000)	Variance M5 (£000)	YTD Plan (£000)	YTD Actual (£000)	YTD Variance (£000)	Annual Plan (£000)
Normalised Surplus/(Deficit) before PSF	-1,817	-1,656	161	-11,809	-11,615	195	-23,370
PSF	281	281	0	1,195	1,195	0	4,221
Surplus/(Deficit) post PSF	-1,536	1,375	161	-10,614	-10,420	195	-19,149
Capital Expenditure	447	238	-209	1,518	697	-821	4,600
Cash and Equivalents	1,220	1,701	481				
Trust Efficiency Savings	890	926	37	3,632	4,513	881	13,000
Use of Resources Metric	3	3		3	3		3

Report To:	EXECUTIVE CABINET
Date:	24 October 2018
Report Of:	Sandra Stewart – Director of Governance and Pensions (Borough Solicitor)
Subject Matter:	PROPOSAL FOR A FORM OF INDEMNITY TO BE GRANTED TO MEMBERS AND OFFICERS
Report Summary:	The Local Government (Indemnity of Members and Officers) Order 2004 allows local authorities to provide an indemnity to protect members and officers when acting on behalf of the authority, which goes beyond the long-standing indemnity provisions that are in place. A form of indemnity is suggested for adoption by the Council.
Recommendation(s):	To support the recommendation that the Executive Cabinet recommend to Council to refresh the existing indemnity and adopt a form of indemnity attached to this report.
Financial Implications: (Authorised By The Section 151 Officer)	In the event that any member or officer calls on the benefits of the indemnity, there will be a financial implication for the Council. The existing indemnity has been in place since 1999 without any calls being made upon it to date.
Legal Implications: (Authorised By The Borough Solicitor)	The Council has the power to provide an indemnity by virtue of the Local Authorities (Indemnity of Members and Officers) Order 2004. Without such an indemnity, members and officers acting on behalf of the Council have no form of protection against personal liability for the matters covered by the Order. There is already an existing indemnity but it is appropriate after 20 years to refresh such indemnity.
Risk Management:	By providing an indemnity, the Council relieves its members and officers of some of the risks of acting on behalf of the Council and provide comfort to those who may otherwise not volunteer to act on the Council's behalf.
Links To Community Plan:	This report has no direct link to the Community Plan; however it will help to support the decision-making which in turn will help to deliver the plan.


Access To Information

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

This report does not contain information which warrants its consideration in the absence of the Press or members of the public

Reference Documents:

The background papers relating to this report can be inspected by contacting the report writer, Dyfrig Lewis-Smith

 Telephone: 0161 301 7181

 e-mail: dyfrig.lewis-smith@tameside.gov.uk

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Under section 265 of the Public Health Act 1875 councillors and local authority officers, when acting in the course of their duties and in good faith, have statutory immunity and are not personally liable for actions they take. The Act provides for indemnity in relation to personal liabilities and also costs.
- 1.2 The Local Authorities (Indemnities for Member and Officers) Order 2004 gives a specific power for authorities to grant indemnities and / or take out insurance to cover the potential liability of councillors and officers in a wider range of circumstances than under the 1875 Act. Each local authority has discretion to decide whether to use the powers and to decide the extent of such indemnities.
- 1.3 At the present time councillors may incur personal liability, or have to defend themselves where allegations are made that:-
 - a) They acted outside the powers of the authority.
 - b) They acted in bad faith, or fraudulently or out of malice.
 - c) Their actions constitute a criminal offence.
 - d) They made a defamatory statement.
- 1.4 Councillors may also be liable, or attract allegations for:-
 - a) Activities where members are appointed to or working with outside bodies in their role as a councillor.
 - b) Action taken for an alleged failure to comply with the member's code of conduct.
- 1.5 In relation to officers, Councils have always been able to indemnify officers and take out insurance cover when an officer acts within his or her powers for the Council, in order to protect the Council in the event of an officer's actions or inactions giving rise to a claim. The 2004 order allows the Council to indemnify officers where they have acted outside of the powers of the authority but reasonably believed that the action was within the powers at the time they were taken, or where they are acting on outside bodies for the Council.
- 1.6 Given the wide range of council activities, the complexity of issues councillors and officers' face, and the demands made on their time, it is considered appropriate for the Council to provide an indemnity where a councillor / officer inadvertently acts outside the powers given, whilst believing s/he is acting in the interests of the Council.
- 1.7 For both councillors and officers the 2004 order restricts the provisions of indemnities so that they cannot cover any findings of criminal liability or liability arising from fraud, deliberate wrongdoing, or the cost of pursuing a defamation claim. In such cases any costs incurred under the indemnity would normally have to be repaid to the Council or insurer.

2. PROPOSED FORM OF INDEMNITY

- 2.1 A form of indemnity, which sets out the scope of indemnity and restrictions required by the Order, is set out in **Appendix A**.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 These are as set out at the front of this report.

APPENDIX A

PROPOSED FORM OF INDEMNITY

INTRODUCTION AND INTERPRETATION

1. In pursuance of its powers under the Local Authorities (Indemnities for Members and Officers) Order 2004, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council grants an indemnity to any member or officer on the terms and subject to the restrictions set out below.
2. The extent of the Indemnity granted by paragraph 1 is set out in paragraphs 5 to 9, and is subject to the restrictions and terms set out in paragraphs 10 to 15.
3. In this document:
 - a. “the Council” means Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council;
 - b. “Part 3 proceeding” means any investigation, report, reference, adjudication or any other proceeding pursuant to Part 3 of the Local Government Act 2000; and
 - c. “secure”, in relation to any indemnity provided by means of insurance, includes arranging for, and paying for, that insurance.
4. The Council may, In addition to the indemnity under paragraph 1 above, in the cases mentioned in paragraphs 5 to 9 below, provide further indemnity by securing the insurance of any of its members or officers.]

CIRCUMSTANCES TO WHICH THE INDEMNITY APPLIES

5. THE indemnity provided by paragraph 1 applies in relation to any action of, or failure to act by, the member or officer in question, which:
 - a. is authorised by the Council; or
 - b. forms part of, or arises from, any powers conferred, or duties placed, upon that member or officer, as a consequence of any function being exercised by that member or officer (whether or not when exercising that function she or he does so in her or his capacity as a member or officer of the Council):
 - i. at the request of, or with the approval of the Council, or
 - ii. for the purposes of the Council.
6. The indemnity granted by paragraph 1 shall also apply to:
 - a. the defence of any criminal proceedings brought against the officer or member; or
 - b. any civil liability arising as a consequence of any action or failure to act which also constitutes a criminal offence; or
 - c. the defence by a member or officer of any allegation of defamation made against her or him.
7. The indemnity granted by paragraph 1 applies to the extent that the member or officer in question:
 - a. believed that the action, or failure to act, in question was within the powers of the Council, or
 - b. where that action or failure comprises the issuing or authorisation of any document containing any statement as to the powers of the Council, or any statement that certain steps have been taken or requirements fulfilled, believed that the contents of that statement were true, and it was reasonable for that member or officer to hold that belief at the time when she or he acted or failed to act.

8. The indemnity granted under paragraph 1 shall apply in relation to an act or omission which is subsequently found to be beyond the powers of the member or officer in question but only to the extent that the member or officer reasonably believed that the act or omission in question was within her or his powers at the time at which she or he acted.
9. The indemnity granted by paragraph 1 shall apply to:
 - a. Any matter occurring on or after the date of its granting by the Council, and also any matter occurring in the twelve months prior to that date; and
 - b. any member or officer currently elected to or employed by the Council, and any member or officer who was elected to or employed by the Council in the past but has since ceased to be a member or an officer.

RESTRICTIONS AND TERMS

10. The indemnity granted under paragraph 1 shall not apply in any case where the member or officer has settled or compromised any claim without first obtaining the agreement of the Council to do so.
11. The indemnity provided under paragraph 1 shall not apply in relation to any action by, or failure to act by, any member or officer which:
 - a. constitutes a criminal offence; or
 - b. is the result of fraud, or other deliberate wrongdoing or recklessness on the part of that member or officer.
12. The indemnity granted under paragraph 1 above shall not apply to any claim in relation to an alleged defamation of any member or officer.
13. A member or officer shall reimburse the Council or the insurer (as the case may be) on the terms set out in paragraph 14 below for any sums expended by the Council or insurer pursuant to the indemnity or insurance in relation to the defence of:
 - a. any criminal proceedings; or
 - b. any Part 3 proceedings.
14. The obligation to reimburse applies:
 - a. In the case of criminal proceedings, if the member or officer in question is convicted of a criminal offence and that conviction is not overturned following any appeal, and
 - b. in the case of Part 3 proceedings:
 - i. if a finding is made in those proceedings that the member in question has failed to comply with the Code of Conduct and that finding is not overturned following any appeal, or
 - ii. if the member admits that she or he has failed to comply with the Code of Conduct,
15. Where a member or officer is obliged to reimburse The Council or the insurer pursuant to paragraphs 13 and 14 above, those sums shall be recoverable by the Council or insurer (as the case may be) as a civil debt.

Report To:	EXECUTIVE CABINET
Date:	24 October 2018
Executive Member / Reporting Officer:	Councillor Allison Gwynne, Executive Member- Neighbourhoods Emma Varnam - Assistant Director – Operations & Neighbourhoods
Subject:	LED STREET LIGHTING
Report Summary:	<p>A report was presented at the Council's Strategic Planning & Capital Monitoring Panel in December 2014, and subsequently approved by Executive Board, to consider the way forward for the Council's street lighting assets, including energy costs. It was recommended that a wholesale LED lantern replacement scheme for residential streets should be undertaken. Also recommended was an assessment on the viability of an LED lantern replacement for the main roads to be undertaken after 3 years (2018).</p> <p>This report sets out the two options for the viability of replacing the main road lanterns with LED's.</p>
Recommendations:	A wholesale LED lantern replacement programme should be considered for the remaining main road traffic routes over two years at a cost of £3.6M. This will deliver revenue savings of £274,375 per year based on current prices.
Links to Community Strategy:	The Street Lighting LED Main Road Programme seeks to provide an improved and more sustainable highway related asset for the residents and businesses of Tameside, thereby contributing to a safe environment, continuing economic regeneration and contributing to a low carbon economy; key priorities within the 2012-22 Tameside Sustainable Community Strategy.
Policy Implications:	<p>The proposed programme supports the Council's Corporate Plan priorities around the Sustainable Community Strategy.</p> <p>It also supports the objectives of the Greater Manchester 3rd Local Transport Plan and associated strategies thereby underpinning its aims and objectives at a regional and local level.</p>
Financial Implications: (Authorised by the Section 151 Officer)	<p>A previous report was presented at the Council's Strategic Planning and Capital Monitoring Panel in December 2014 for £5M to begin a wholesale LED lantern replacement programme starting initially with the residential roads. This was later approved by Executive Cabinet. At the time of the December 2014 report it was not economically viable to undertake a replacement programme for the Main Road lanterns due to the payback period being 28 years. The report recommended that after three years another feasibility assessment should be undertaken on the financial viability of an LED replacement scheme for the main roads, due to the anticipated improvements in this technology and expected reductions in lantern costs.</p> <p>This report discusses the outlay of £3.6M for LED lanterns on main roads which have been appraised in section 3. It has now</p>

been projected to have a payback period of 13 years and the operational life is 25 years under the manufacturer's guarantee. However, it fails to take into account time value of money and does not factor in the additional cash flows beyond the payback period.

A total of £3.6M has been earmarked for LED Lighting in the capital programme in October 2017. The breakdown of this amount can be reviewed in Table 5 of this report. The scheme has been marked as 'business critical in the review of the capital programme paper to Board in July 2018. The scheme is deemed to be business critical due to the potential savings of £0.274M. Based on feedback from STAR procurement, there is a potential to achieve further savings which should be explored.

Table 8 provides an outline of on the project delivery over a period of two years. The analysis of forecast savings or cost avoidance expected from the delivery of LED street lamp replacement on residential and main roads is shown in tables 2 and 3.

The Medium Term Financial Plan assumes a net savings of £0.25M from 2019/20 as a result of undertaking this project. However, such savings are subject to inflation and change in energy costs, so the service area should ensure that energy usage is monitored alongside actual cost to track and demonstrate that savings are being delivered by this investment.

This project offers more sustainable and environmental friendly way of conducting operations as there will be less co2 emissions and hence council will improve its carbon foot prints targets.

Expenditure on capital scheme must comply with guidance from Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting. Any none capital related expenditure will be transferred to revenue and funded from existing revenue budgets.

Legal Implications:
(Authorised by the Borough Solicitor)

The Council has statutory powers under s97 Highways Act 1980 to light highways for which it is responsible. It is also responsible for lighting some traffic signs under the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016. However, any approach in respect of lighting must be undertaken as efficiently and effectively as possible. This is more important given the significant calls on budget.

Risk Management:

- Inclement weather preventing commencement and completion of schemes.

A comprehensive programme of works will be agreed between partners to ensure completion by approved dates. However, should the programme not be achieved it may be necessary to arrange for any outstanding financial resources to be transferred into the following financial year.

- Inability of suppliers to deliver materials within a time frame to meet completion targets.

If the successful supplier cannot meet the demand in line with the proposed installation schedule, then approval will be sought to carry over the project into the subsequent year for completion.

- The ability of the Council's own *Operational Services* or external contractors to implement the programme in the two year timescale of the project.

This risk will be managed by ensuring that should Operational Services or the external contractor be unable to complete the works during the timescale, approval will be sought to carry over the project into the subsequent year for completion.

Access to Information:

The background papers relating to this report can be inspected by contacting the report authors, Lee Holland



Telephone:0161 342 3978



e-mail: lee.holland@tameside.gov.uk

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Proposed Investment

- 1.1 To replace all the main road street lighting lanterns with new energy efficient LED lanterns in order to reduce the Council's energy consumption and its CO2 emissions.

Options for Investment

- 1.2 Two options including a "do nothing" have been explored. Option 1 which is the wholesale replacement of the main road lanterns to LED lanterns is the preferred option and will ensure the Council achieves its revenue savings, the "do nothing" option will not achieve those revenue savings.

Project Delivery

- 1.3 The delivery of the project will be managed through the Council's Design & Delivery Service with aspects of the project procured via existing framework contracts.

Financial Investment Requirement

- 1.4 Option 1 is the preferred option and will require an investment of £3.6M.

Project Management and Monitoring

- 1.5 The project management will be undertaken by the Council's Design and Delivery Service, regular progress reporting will be via the Council's Strategic Planning and Capital Monitoring Panel

Conclusion

- 1.6 Option 1 is the preferred option which will result in the entire highway network being illuminated by LED lanterns. The replacement costs will be £3.6M phased over two years. This will deliver revenue savings of £274,375 per year based on current prices.

2 PROPOSED INVESTMENT

Background and Existing Arrangements

Introduction

- 2.1 A report was presented at the Council's Strategic Planning & Capital Monitoring Panel in December 2014 for £5m, and subsequently approved by Executive Board, to consider the way forward for the Council's street lighting assets, including energy costs. It was recommended that a wholesale LED lantern replacement scheme for residential streets should be undertaken. Also recommended was an assessment on the viability of an LED lantern replacement for the main roads to be undertaken after 3 years (2018) which is considered in this report.

Why are we proposing to do this?

- 2.2 The 1980 Highways Act empowers Highway Authorities to provide and maintain lighting on highways for which they are responsible (Section 97). The legal requirements for the illumination of traffic signs are set out in the 2002 Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions. Street lighting is provided as an aid to road safety, to assist in the prevention of crime (public safety), and to improve the visual amenity of the street scene.

Existing Funding Arrangements

- 2.3 Street Lighting is a major area of expenditure for the Authority, with a revenue budget of just over £2 million per year, £1.56 million of which is for energy (see Table 1 below) and the remainder used for repairs and maintenance. The Council is responsible for the following total illuminated street furniture worth around £49m in Gross Replacement Cost terms (as submitted as part of Whole of Government accounts 2017/18):

- 17,000 side road lighting columns (previous LED project)
- 7,500 main road lighting columns

- 2,556 illuminated signs
- 912 illuminated bollards

2.4 As well as ensuring that the lights are adequately situated and that the lamps are providing adequate light, street lighting lamps need replacing approximately once every five years (meaning around 1,500 lamps will need to be replaced over the course of each year for the main roads). Electrical testing of all our installations needs to be carried out and the structure of the lighting equipment also needs to be maintained and monitored to ensure it is safe. In order to ensure that the columns remain in a safe condition it is estimated that up to 1,000 columns should be replaced every year.

2.5 Managing these replacements is a major task with heavy reliance being placed on the inventory records held by the Authority which need to provide accurate information regarding the position of the street lighting, the type of equipment that is being used and the date any components were last replaced in order to ensure the right columns and lamps are replaced at the right time.

2.6 As budgets across the Authority are reduced it is important to ensure that the controls in place within street lighting are robust and effective in order to ensure that a potentially reduced service does not result in increased risk to the Authority or to the safety of the general public.

Revenue Budgets (2017/18)

2.7 Revenue budgets to support the delivery of this service are detailed below (Table 1) indicating the relative expenditure levels for street lighting related functions:

Table 1: Revenue Budgets 2017/18

Function	Budget £000's	% of Total
Street Lighting energy	1,561	76.5%
Street Lighting reactive maintenance	243	11.9%
Street Lighting Bulk Change & Clean (planned maintenance)	164	8.0%
Bollards maintenance	4	0.2%
Bollards Bulk Change & Clean	28	1.4%
Signs Maintenance	20	1.0%
Signs Bulk Change & Clean	10	0.5%
Street Lighting painting	10	0.5%
Total	2,040	100%

2.8 The revenue budget for energy costs has previously been reduced to reflect anticipated energy savings from the installation of LED lamps in residential areas. The Medium Term Financial Plan assumes further net savings of £250k from 2019/20 after inflationary pressures for energy costs.

Business Needs/Council policies, strategies and plans

2.9 This proposal is an invest to save project which when complete will save the council £274,395 per annum in energy and maintenance costs. It will also provide an opportunity to ensure the council's street lighting inventory is accurate and up to date, enabling those assets to be managed effectively.

Spending Objectives

2.10 The successful outcome can be summarised as below:

- contributing to a low carbon economy
- safe environment
- continuing economic regeneration
- reduced energy consumption

Previous Report

- 2.11 The report presented at the Council's Strategic Planning & Capital Monitoring Panel in December 2014 and subsequently approved by Executive Board contained the following information regarding the street lighting assets and maintenance regime.
- Planned Maintenance (Bulk Change and Clean Programme)
 - Strategic Risk Management (Visual Inspections)
 - Electrical Inspections.
 - Structural Testing.
 - Column Replacement Programme.
 - Inventory / Data Collection.
- 2.12 For further information on these items please refer to the previous report

Street Lighting LED Residential Roads Project

- 2.13 The LED report in December 2014 recommendation for a wholesale LED lantern replacement programme starting initially with the residential roads (circa 17,000 lanterns) at a cost of £5M, over a three year period. This was subsequently approved by the Executive Cabinet.
- 2.14 The council's in-house Design and Delivery team started this project in April 2015 and are due to complete by December 2018. Table 2 below shows the costs / savings envisaged in the December 2014 report and the anticipated outturn figures:

Table 2: LED Residential Roads Project Forecast Outturn

	December 2014 Report	Estimated outturn figures
Capital Expenditure	£5,000,000	£5,000,000
Annual Energy Savings	£451,270	£494,053

These energy savings have been calculated based on January 2018 tariffs.

- 2.15 As can be seen from the table above the project will be delivered on budget and the energy cost savings (or cost avoidance) should exceed the original forecast. The revenue budget reductions referenced above are a net saving after taking account of inflationary pressures on energy costs.
- 2.16 At the time of the December 2014 report it was not economically viable to undertake a replacement programme for the Main Road lanterns. It was estimated that a capital investment of £4.1M for these lanterns would have a payback period of 28 years.
- 2.17 The report recommended that after three years another feasibility assessment should be undertaken on the financial viability of an LED replacement scheme for the main roads, due to the anticipated improvements in this technology and expected reductions in lantern costs.

3 OPTIONS FOR INVESTMENT

Do Nothing Summary

3.1 The Council would continue with existing cyclic bulk change and clean and general maintenance of main road columns.

Benefits

3.2 There is no additional cost incurred over and above the existing revenue allocations, however energy savings would not be achieved.

Risks

3.3 The council will continue with its usual maintenance regime, with no proactive night inspections reliance is placed on reports from members of the public to actively manage repairs to its lamp outages.

Risks with this Option:

Risk	Likelihood	Outcome/impact	Mitigation
There will be a gradual deterioration of the lighting provision across the main road network	High	Decline in maintenance standards and increased risk of outages.	Increase the revenue budget to optimise maintenance frequency.

Wider impacts

3.4 The benefits of good lighting are well known, especially in the fields of accident reduction and crime/vandalism prevention. At the moment, however, the council relies solely on public reports to actively manage repairs to its lamp outages. We do not currently carry out any proactive night inspections to monitor our non-operational street lighting assets around the borough. There is therefore a possibility that the number of night time accidents and criminal activities will increase. Visiting our assets less often also means that there are fewer opportunities to visually inspect our columns and signs, which increases the potential risk to the council.

Option 1: Wholesale LED replacement of the main road lanterns

Summary

3.5 A wholesale LED replacement programme for the main road lanterns, similar to the side road lantern scheme. It is envisaged that this project would take two years to complete.

Benefits

3.6 The new modern LED lanterns will produce energy savings circa £227,797 per annum, together with guaranteed 25 years useful life expectancy of the lantern. Reductions in associated CO2 emission and maintenance costs. Also it provides the opportunity to ensure the inventory is up to date and correct.

Costs

3.7 The investment required to replace the main road lanterns with energy efficient LED lanterns is estimated at £3.6M. Table 3 below indicates the amount of investment required for the main road scheme and payback period.

Risks with this Option

Risk	Likelihood	Outcome/impact	Mitigation
Delays to delivering the project over the 2 years forecast	Low	Energy savings would be delayed and have an impact on revenue budgets	Ensure appropriate project management and monitoring is undertaken

Financial Viability Assessment for LED Main Road Lanterns

3.8 The energy budget for 2017/18 is £1.56M. This figure will significantly reduce next financial year due to the installation of the residential roads LED scheme. The amount of this budget attributable to the main road energy costs is £627K.

3.9 There are not only energy savings when the lanterns are changed to LED's, additional savings are achieved in the CO2 emissions, although this is a notional saving at present because we are not charged for these emissions yet. Further savings will be achieved in maintenance costs due to fewer lamp changes and lamp failures associated with LEDs. The lamp changes savings are based on a 6 year life expectancy for non LED lamps, with one sixth of our lamps being replaced per year. The lamp failures saving is based on a 17% failure rate during the 6 year life expectancy of the non LED lamps. Table 3 below shows the anticipated total savings attributable to the main road LED lantern replacement scheme (per year) based on current energy costs:

Table 3: Forecast Savings

Lamp Number	Lamp Type	Existing energy cost	New energy cost	Co2 saving	Energy savings	Saving in lamp changes	Saving in lamp failures
2152	100w	£131,784	£98,075	£1,728	£33,709	£11,658	£1,333
3584	150w	£315,970	£208,395	£5,516	£107,575	£19,732	£2,274
1016	250w	£137,844	£69,720	£3,493	£68,124	£5,713	£665
220	90w	£15,098	£10,026	£260	£5,072	£1,875	£252
273	135w	£25,653	£12,441	£677	£13,212	£2,644	£367
5	180w	£649	£544	£5	£105	£74	£11
7250		£626,998	£399,201	£11,679	£227,797	£41,696	£4,902
Total Savings:						£274,395	

3.10 As can be seen savings totalling £274,395 (based on current energy costs) can be achieved per year if the main road lanterns were replaced with LED lanterns.

Wider impacts

3.11 The installation of LED lanterns on the main roads throughout the borough will not only have energy savings but will also reduce the CO2 emissions which will be more beneficial to the environment. It will also reduce the maintenance demand on the street lighting service.

Summary/Preferred Option

3.12 Option 1 is the preferred option because it will deliver energy savings and reduce CO2 emissions, the do nothing option will not achieve these savings. Option 1 also will ensure

that our street lighting inventory is accurate and up to date with the relevant information required to manage these assets.

Table 4: Summary of Options

	Do nothing	Option 1 Wholesale LED lanterns replacement for main roads
Replacement of the main road lanterns	x	✓
Energy Cost Savings	x	✓
Reduce CO2 Emissions	x	✓
Update street lighting inventory	x	✓
Potential achievability	✓	✓
Potential affordability	✓	✓
Summary	Discounted	Preferred

4 FINANCIAL INVESTMENT REQUIRED

Table 5: Proposed Main Road LED Investment

	Main Roads
Number of Lanterns in need of replacement	7,500
Lantern replacement cost	£2,400,000
Installation costs (including electrical testing)	£900,000
Design Fees	£100,000
Traffic Management Costs	£200,000
Total Capital Investment required	£3,600,000
Payback period based forecast savings in Table 3	13 years

(Payback Period - The length of time required to recover the cost of an investment. The payback period of a given investment or project is an important determinant of whether to undertake the project, as longer payback periods are typically not desirable for investment proposals).

- 4.1 Current estimates as outlined above indicate that an initial capital outlay of £3.6M on the main roads would payback over a period of 13 years. The LED lanterns installed would be expected to be operational for a total of 25 years under the manufacturer's guarantee.
- 4.2 It is proposed to undertake the main road lantern replacement scheme using the Council's in-house Design and Delivery team over a two year timescale. The procurement of the LED lanterns will be undertaken via an existing Greater Manchester Supplier Framework (if suitable) or a tendering process similar to the side road lantern purchase. The intended profiling of Capital Expenditure and lantern replacements is shown in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Investment Profile

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Capital Expenditure	£1,600,000	£2,000,000	
Number of Lanterns Replaced	3,500	4,000	
Forecast Energy Savings	£0	£109,494	£241,670

- 4.3 The anticipated energy saving (or cost avoidance) over the 25 year useful life of the lanterns is shown in Table 7 below. The current and LED energy costs are based on current tariffs, assuming inflationary increases of 3% per annum. There will be additional savings in a reduction to lamp changes and lamp failures that are costs associated with maintaining the current inventory.

Table 7: Forecasted Future Savings

Year	Current Main Rd Energy Costs (3% inflation)	Forecast LED Main Rd Energy Costs (3% Inflation)	Forecast Annual Energy Savings (3% Inflation)	Forecast Annual Energy Savings (5% Inflation)	Annual Energy & Maintenance Savings (3% Inflation)	Annual Energy & Maintenance Savings (5% Inflation)
1	£626,998	£399,201	£227,797	£227,797	£274,395	£274,395
2	£645,808	£411,177	£234,631	£239,187	£282,627	£288,115
3	£665,182	£423,512	£241,670	£251,146	£291,106	£302,520
4	£685,138	£436,218	£248,920	£263,704	£299,839	£317,647
5	£705,692	£449,304	£256,388	£276,889	£308,834	£333,529
6	£726,863	£462,783	£264,079	£290,733	£318,099	£350,205
7	£748,668	£476,667	£272,002	£305,270	£327,642	£367,716
8	£771,128	£490,967	£280,162	£320,533	£337,471	£386,101
9	£794,262	£505,696	£288,566	£336,560	£347,595	£405,406
10	£818,090	£520,867	£297,223	£353,388	£358,023	£425,677
11	£842,633	£536,493	£306,140	£371,057	£368,764	£446,961
12	£867,912	£552,588	£315,324	£389,610	£379,827	£469,309
13	£893,949	£569,165	£324,784	£409,091	£391,222	£492,774
14	£920,768	£586,240	£334,528	£429,545	£402,958	£517,413
15	£948,391	£603,827	£344,563	£451,022	£415,047	£543,283
16	£976,842	£621,942	£354,900	£473,574	£427,498	£570,447
17	£1,006,148	£640,600	£365,547	£497,252	£440,323	£598,970
18	£1,036,332	£659,818	£376,514	£522,115	£453,533	£628,918
19	£1,067,422	£679,613	£387,809	£548,221	£467,139	£660,364
20	£1,099,445	£700,001	£399,443	£575,632	£481,153	£693,382
21	£1,132,428	£721,001	£411,427	£604,413	£495,588	£728,052
22	£1,166,401	£742,631	£423,770	£634,634	£510,456	£764,454
23	£1,201,393	£764,910	£436,483	£666,366	£525,769	£802,677
24	£1,237,435	£787,858	£449,577	£699,684	£541,542	£842,811
25	£1,274,558	£811,493	£463,064	£734,668	£557,789	£884,951
Total	£22,859,886	£14,554,575	£8,305,311	£10,872,090	£10,004,240	£13,096,077

5. PROJECT DELIVERY

- 5.1 If the council was to approve the installation of LED lanterns on the main roads, then we would need to establish a supplier for the LED lanterns, we would consult with STAR to source an appropriate framework contract or undertake a procurement exercise, in accordance with Council's Standing Orders. During this procurement period the installation

programme would be agreed to determine which areas should be delivered first and in what order. Once the supplier contract has been secured the lighting design for each of the main roads can be finalised. It is envisaged that a start on site to replace the lanterns would commence in March 2019

- 5.2 Installation of the lanterns would be delivered in-house via the Design and Delivery Service, similar to the recently installed LED side road programme.

Table 8: Project Delivery Forecast

Activity	Y1				Y2			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Lantern Procurement								
Lighting Design								
Installation								

Procurement Risks

- 5.3 There are no significant procurement risks associated with the delivery of the preferred option as the design skills and construction deliverables are either in-house or within existing framework contracts. Also the products are standard items and readily available.

Risk	Likelihood	Outcome/impact	Mitigation
The project could be delayed due to the availability of some key contractors and suppliers	Low	Project will take longer to deliver	Alternative contractors / suppliers appointed
Inclement weather during construction	Low / medium	Delay to overall project timescale	Phase construction over a number of seasons

6 Project Management and Monitoring

Project Management, governance and reporting arrangements

- 6.1 The project will be procured and project managed by Operations & Neighbourhood – Head of Design & Delivery. Engineers / QS Supervisors will manage and monitor each package of work which will include quality, timescales and budget control in accordance with section 4.

Project monitoring

- 6.2 Regular monitoring and reporting will be provided to the Capital Monitoring Group and Strategic Capital Group.

Contract Management

- 6.3 All external contracts will be managed by the Head of Design & Delivery and will be mainly delivered through the Engineers existing framework contracts or STAR frameworks. Alternative contractors will be sourced if existing framework contractors are not available.

Risks and Contingency

- 6.4 The biggest single risk to this project is the availability of contractors to deliver the installation within the given timescales. As this is being delivered via the in-house service and existing framework contracts this risk is minimal, however if during the monitoring of

the project if it felt that additional resources are required a further framework contractor(s) will be appointed.

Post Implementation Review

- 6.5 The ongoing revenue monitoring process will be used to measure the success of this project to ensure it achieves the savings envisaged.

7 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The use of LED technology is fundamental in order for the council to achieve its savings targets by reducing energy consumption and associated costs. Energy prices are likely to increase in the future requiring additional corporate support. The fact that other councils are employing this technology and taking more drastic measures will reduce demand which is only likely to drive the cost of raw energy up further. The availability of a new generation of LED technology increases the attraction in terms of cost savings and serious consideration of replacing the remaining main road lanterns needs to be made.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 As set out on the front of the report.

Report to:	EXECUTIVE CABINET
Date:	24 October 2018
Executive Officer:	Member/Reporting Officer: Councillor Allison Gwynne – Neighbourhood Services Emma Varnam – Assistant Director – Neighbourhood & Operations
Subject:	REPLACEMENT OF CREMATORS AND MERCURY ABATEMENT, FILTRATION PLANT AND HEAT RECOVERY FACILITIES.
Report Summary:	<p>The report provides information on replacing the cremators, mercury abatement and all auxiliary equipment at Dukinfield Crematorium in order to meet its statutory requirements.</p> <p>Key objectives are to ensure the Council meets its legal obligations with regard to providing a cremation service and the impacts on air quality and protecting the environment to protect public health.</p>
Recommendations:	<p>To agree for Executive Cabinet to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. To support and recommend that the proposed works are carried out as set out in the report from Capital allocation.2. That a lifecycle fund is created from income collected for service delivery to enable the cremators to be replaced at the end of their life without it being an unplanned call on the capital programme.
Links to Community Strategy:	The scheme seeks to provide an improved and more sustainable asset for the residents of Tameside, thereby contributing to a safe environment and continuing economic key priorities within the 2012-22 Tameside Sustainable Community Strategy. It shows a commitment to the Air Quality Plan with the emphasis on reducing pollution to the environment within the borough of Tameside, which also improves the public health of the residents.
Policy Implications:	None.
Financial Implications: (authorised by Section 151 Officer)	In October 2017, £1.5m was earmarked in the capital programme to fund this capital project. A further £1m was reported as a pressure and earmarked in July 2018 in the Executive Board paper for the review of the capital programme. This was also listed as a business critical scheme due to the nature of work required. The £2.500m estimated cost of this scheme is based on quotations from other organisations. If the successful tender price is significantly different from the £2.500m estimate, a revised business case will be submitted with a full breakdown of the cost. In future years, it is proposed that the existing environmental levy placed on each cremation will be used to establish a financial reserve for on-going repair and maintenance of the cremators.
Legal Implications: (authorised by Borough Solicitor)	Not to comply with legislation affecting crematoriums puts any operator in breach of their statutory obligations. The Council must ensure the necessary compliance whilst complying with its statutory duty to ensure any expenditure is efficient and effective and achieves a balanced budget.

Risk Management :

The Council will be in breach of its environmental permit if it can no longer abate the particulates being released into the atmosphere. Air quality and environmental standards are compromised if the proposed works are not carried out. Ad hoc repairs will continue to be carried out on the equipment to ensure compliance until replacement equipment is in situ. There would be a major loss of revenue income to the Local Authority should the cremators not be in working order. This could cause substantial Public Health issues.

Access to Information :

The background papers relating to this report can be inspected by contacting Mike Gurney, Head of Management and Operations



Telephone:0161 342 5181



e-mail: Michael.gurney@tameside.gov.uk

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Proposed Investment

- 1.1 To replace the cremators, mercury abatement and heat exchangers and auxiliary equipment at Dukinfield Crematorium due to the current equipment coming to the end of their working life and to ensure compliance with Environmental legislation.

Options for Investment

- 1.2 Option 1, which is to replace the 3 cremators at Dukinfield Crematorium, with the consideration as to whether 100% mercury abatement or partial abatement is required and fit accordingly and install a new heat recovery system and auxiliary equipment and to carry out minor building works as required, is the preferred option. This option will provide a cremation service for the residents of Tameside and surrounding areas for the next 20 – 25 years and will ensure that the borough has a cleaner, greener and safer environment for all.

Project Delivery

- 1.3 The project will be delivered by private contractors via the procurement process and Council's standing orders and through The Chest tender process, or current frameworks already in place, in order to achieve a best value and best quality solution.

Financial Investment Requirement

- 1.4 The project will require an approximate investment of £2.500m capital monies. Full details can be found in Table 1 at 3.9

Project Management and Monitoring

- 1.5 The project specification is currently being produced by National Industrial Fuel Efficiency Service Consultants, (NIFES), and the delivery of the project will be delivered by the successful tender contractor. The works will be overseen by the Council's Design and Delivery team along with the Head of Bereavement Services.

Conclusion

- 1.6 The proposed works to replace the cremators, abatement equipment and heat recovery equipment at Dukinfield Crematorium are essential in order to be able to continue to provide a cremation service for the residents of the borough, to ensure staff are working in a safe environment, to meet the Council's statutory obligations with regard to The Environmental Protection Act and the Cremation Regulations, to improve air quality in the borough and control the emissions of harmful pollutants in the environment and to adhere to the Council's Environmental Health regulators permit. The project will also allow the Council to continue receiving an essential, significant, income stream; it will provide an improved facility and asset and could potentially support local business.

Recommendation

- 1.7 Firstly, that support is given for the programme of works as indicated in Option 1 which is to replace the 3 cremators at Dukinfield Crematorium, with the consideration as to whether 100% mercury abatement or partial abatement is required and fit accordingly and install a new heat recovery system and auxiliary equipment and to carry out minor building works as required.

Secondly, that in future years the existing environmental levy placed on each cremation is used to establish a financial reserve, to be used for on-going repair and maintenance of the cremators.

2 PROPOSED INVESTMENT

Background and Existing Arrangements

Introduction

- 2.1 The chapel building in Dukinfield Cemetery was built in 1865 and in 1953 the crematorium was adapted from the Church of England and Non-Conformist chapels, the former being retained for use as the crematorium chapel and the latter being adapted to be the crematory which is where all the technical equipment (cremators etc.) are housed. This was in order to meet the growing demand for cremations nationally.
- 2.2 This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 for its special architectural or historic interest and as such, carrying out work both internally and externally has always been complex and somewhat challenging whilst trying to meet the demands from Central Government in adhering to environmental standards.
- 2.3 Dukinfield Crematorium is a busy crematorium carrying out over 2000 cremations annually. It is also the third busiest crematorium in Greater Manchester. The table below, issued by The Federation of Cremation Authorities, shows the cremation statistics from across the conurbation for the period January – December 2017. As part of the budget setting process, Tameside Council Bereavement Services carries out a benchmarking exercise on fees & charges annually with all the Greater Manchester Bereavement Services to ensure its fees & charges are in line and consistent with others.

Name of Crematorium	No of Cremations
Stockport	2479
Bolton	2195
Tameside	2092
Manchester (Private)	2021
Salford	1841
Oldham	1586
Trafford	1552
Rochdale	1322
Wigan	1128
Manchester (Council)	1112
Bury	1011

Why are we proposing to do this?

- 2.4 The current three cremators were installed in 1998. The life expectancy of cremators, based on the capacity they are being used at Dukinfield, is between 15 and 20 years. They are clearly now at the end of their working life as they are now 20 years old.
- 2.5 The three cremators are now in need of replacement. Due to their constant use and their age, the cremators are now susceptible to mechanical breakdown and maintenance costs are therefore increasing all the time, which has an impact on revenue spend and can cause inevitable delays when trying to make appointments for funerals with families.
- 2.6 To comply with legislation from DEFRA, mercury abatement was required to be retro-fitted to the existing equipment to ensure 50% of the cremations that took place were abated. Legislation stated that this had to be in place by 1 January 2013. However, due to Tameside Council's commitment to a clean environment, Dukinfield Crematorium installed its 50% mercury abatement programme, together with a Heat Recovery System, in 2009. This abatement equipment needs to be replaced as it would not be compatible with any new installation of cremators.
- 2.7 Due to the fact that the mercury abatement equipment was also added to the cremators at a later date, the emission monitoring tests that are regularly carried out, show particulates

being realised could fail if mercury abatement equipment is not replaced as part of the project. The Council would be in breach of its conditions of the environmental permit should that occur.

Existing Funding Arrangements

- 2.8 The net 2018/2019 income budget for Bereavement Services is £1,281m. The income which Bereavement Services brings in contributes to the overall budget of Operations & Neighbourhoods Directorate in ensuring that, as a team, we balance the budget. In future years, it is proposed that the existing environmental levy placed on each cremation is used to establish a financial reserve, to be used for on-going repair and maintenance of the cremators. This reserve could be in the region of £100k per annum.

Options not considered

To only have 2 cremators installed.

- 2.9 3 cremators are required to deal with the number of cremations carried out at Dukinfield. The operational cremation process at Dukinfield is managed by officers and trained staff that follow the guiding principles such as BATNEEC (Best Available Techniques Not Entailing Excessive Cost). This means that, where possible, 2 cremators will be used where appropriate to save unnecessarily heating up a third cremator. However, this decision is balanced taking into account other factors such as staff working hours in order to comply to with shift patterns in place, large coffins which take longer, maintenance work being carried out on the cremators etc. It is very rare that the demands of the service only require the use of just 2 cremators on any working day. To only have 2 cremators installed would also put a pressure on meeting the demands of funerals should there be any down time on one of the cremators.

To install 4 cremators

- 2.10 There is not sufficient space to install 4 cremators. There is also no business case in installing 4 cremators. The number of cremations that can be carried out are dictated by the actual number of funeral service slots available within the chapel. 3 cremators are sufficient to deal with the maximum number of services that can be carried out should every available appointment be taken up for a funeral service. If the death rate was to increase significantly, families would potentially have to have to wait a couple of days longer to hold a funeral service, but this, as is the case now through busy periods, would be managed by staff.

Low Cost Options

- 2.11 The low cost option would be to do nothing.

Business Needs/Council policies, strategies and plans

- 2.12 The percentage of people choosing cremation as an option over burial within Tameside is 70% which is in line with the national percentage.
- 2.13 Whilst the death rate has been significantly down over recent years, it is expected to rise over the next decade.
- 2.14 The Council is also planning to ensure that it is in a position to be able to have the correct equipment in place for further potential changes where 100% of all cremations may have to be abated in line with Government legislation. This was originally going to be by 2020 but no further guidance as yet be issued by DEFRA on this. However, this project will abate 100% of its cremations (space permitting) and will therefore show the Council's commitment to the clean air agenda.
- 2.15 The replacement and installation of new cremators will also support the Council's priorities within the Corporate Plan such as:

- Promote cleaner, greener and safer environment
- Reduce our carbon footprint, both in energy and waste
- Improve health and wellbeing of residents as a result of a safer, cleaner air quality in the borough.

Regional and national policies, strategies and plans

2.16 As per 2.12 above.

Benefits

2.17 The benefits are covered in each of the options

Spending Objectives

2.18 The successful outcome can be summarised as below.

- An upgraded crematorium fit for purpose
- No pollution being released into the atmosphere
- Safe working environment
- Recycling wasted energy to heat building
- Project to be completed within capital budget allowance
- Project to be delivered on time

Risks

2.19 Risks are covered in each of the options.

Scope

2.20 The work being proposed is just for Dukinfield Crematorium which is the only crematorium that the Council has and is responsible for.

Constraints

2.21 The project needs to commence in May 2019 at the latest in order to minimise any disruption to funeral services. Many more funerals take place during the months November to April. It is therefore imperative that works are carried out during the summer months due to the downtime that will inevitably occur whilst the essential works are carried out.

Dependencies

2.22 The delivery of the project is dependent on the specialised market of suppliers and manufacturers and their availability to deliver the work at the given timescales.

3 OPTIONS FOR INVESTMENT

Do Nothing

Summary

3.1 Due to the sensitive nature of the work means that to 'do nothing' is not an option. To 'do nothing' also cannot be considered as the Council has a statutory duty under The Public Health Act 1984 to cause a body to be buried or cremated of any person who has died. To 'do nothing' would also mean that the Council would not be able to continue operating its existing equipment as it would not be compliant with the Environmental Health Act 1990. If the Council could not operate the cremators, no funerals would be able to be carried out. This would create a major public health issue and also have huge implications on revenue income. Not being in a position to operate the cremators would also bring the Council into disrepute and cause a public outcry from the most vulnerable residents of the borough.

Benefits

- 3.2 The only benefits of taking this option would be that the Council would not have to draw down monies from the Council's capital funding.

Risks

Risk	Likelihood	Outcome/impact	Mitigation
No cremations available	High	Public Health Issues	To replace the cremators.
No cremations available	High	Council brought into disrepute	To replace the cremators
No cremations available	High	Significant loss of income	To replace the cremators
Operating non-complaint equipment	High	DEFRA could close crematorium	To replace the cremators
Operate old cremators	High	Not compliant with legislation	To replace the cremators

Cost

- 3.3 There would be major revenue costs in trying to keep up the repairs to old cremators and equipment. There would also be continued downtime as cremators are being repaired which would limit how many services could be taken daily. This would create a backlog of funerals with many families choosing an alternative crematorium. This would then have an impact on revenue budgets as income would be adversely affected.

Wider impacts

- 3.4 The Council's image would be tarnished and not being able to function as a crematorium would bring the Council into disrepute and cause a public outcry from the most vulnerable residents of the borough. Not being compliant with regards to the Environmental Protection Act would also mean an unsafe working environment for staff which would be a breach of Health and Safety legislation.

Option 1

- 3.5 To go out to tender for replacing the 3 cremators at Dukinfield Crematorium, with the consideration as to whether 100% mercury abatement or partial abatement is required and fit accordingly and install a new heat recovery system and auxiliary equipment. To carry out minor building works as required. It is understood that the costs involved of installing 50% abatement equipment against installing 100% abatement is minimal and not significant.

SITE SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.6 The following needs to be taken into consideration:

- All three cremators will be replaced with new machines
- Options as to whether 100% or partial abatement will be considered.
- At least one cremator will be capable of accepting very large coffins due to demand
- The crematorium to remain operational at all times during the refurbishment
- Minor building works within the crematory and chapel
- Air conditioning in crematory and computer room
- Fit for purpose operators computer room

- Soundproofing from crematory to chapel
- Cremators to have auto start and auto shutdown capability
- Remote fault diagnostics and control to be provided
- New ash processing equipment required (Cremulator)
- Ventilation requirements will be considered
- Heat recovery provisions to be included
- Noise levels will be considered
- Automated coffin charging equipment (space permitted)
- Electrics being placed/removed in appropriate place (not mess room)
- Installation to be carried out in summer 2019
- It is understood that the building is Grade 2 listed and cremators will be built on site

Summary

3.7 This option would mean that Tameside Council would be fulfilling its legal requirements with regards to The Environmental Protection Act and be able to continue to provide cremation as an option for Bereaved families.

Benefits

3.8 The following are the benefits of taking this option:

- Commitment to improving Air Quality within the borough and Greater Manchester
- Protecting Public Health and the environment
- Ensuring a Bereavement Service that offers cremation for the residents of the borough
- Ensuring staff in Bereavement Services are working in a safe environment.
- Ensuring that the significant income stream continues to be received for the revenue budget

Risks

Risk	Likelihood	Outcome/impact	Mitigation
Costs from tender admissions come in too high	Medium	Not enough funding/delay in project commencing	Apply for additional funds
Not enough physical space for all equipment	Low	Reduce number of funerals taken per day/loss of income	Ensure prospective contractors can design and deliver as per specification
Project not completed within timescales	Medium	Service delivery disruption/reduced income	Ensure contractor can meet deadlines

Cost

3.9 Indicative costs are looking to be in the region of £2.5m for the above project. However, exact costs cannot be confirmed totally until the tender process has been completed. If, from the tendering process, costs are significantly different, a further report will be produced. To ensure the Council doesn't breach any financial regulations, asking potential cremator suppliers for any costs at this stage has been avoided. The costs provided in the table below have been reached from professionals within the cremation industry who have been through similar projects recently.

Table 1: Summary of estimated costs

Description of Works	Estimated Cost (£)
Replacement 3 cremators	600,000
Abatement Plant	1,000,000
New Stack Liners	100,000
Installation Works, Gas ducting, thermal installation	200,000
Heat Exchanger Works	10,000
Cremulator and ash recovery ventilation	30,000
Ventilation of crematory	40,000
Automated coffin charging equipment	40,000
Relocation of all electrical works	75,000
Commissioning & training acceptance tests	30,000
Internal Building Works	75,000
Contingency	300,000
TOTAL	2,500,000

Wider impacts

- 3.10 Tameside Council has already been innovative when it was one of the first authorities to introduce the heat recovery system to capture the energy from the excess heat in order to heat its crematorium. If it is feasible to abate 100% of its cremations within this project, the Council will be one of the first to do so and this will show a real commitment to the Environment and to increasing the Air Quality of the borough and Greater Manchester as a whole.

Summary/Preferred Option

Table 2: Summary of Options

- 3.11 Option 1, which is to replace the 3 cremators at Dukinfield Crematorium, with the consideration as to whether 100% mercury abatement or partial abatement is required and fit accordingly and install a new heat recovery system and auxiliary equipment and to carry out minor building works as required, is the preferred option.

	Do nothing	Option 1 Replace all equipment
Spending Objectives (see 2.1.9):		
Replace 3 cremators	x	√
Install 100% mercury abatement	x	√
Install Heat Recovery equipment	x	√
Minor Building Works	x	√
Widen hatch in chapel to allow for larger coffins	x	√
New Cremulator	x	√
Summary	Discounted	Preferred

- 3.12 Option 1 would be the preferred option due to the benefits highlighted in 3.2.2. To do nothing cannot be a consideration.

4 PROJECT DELIVERY

Background

- 4.1 Officers from Tameside Bereavement Services have been met with NIFES consulting Group regarding the provision of consultancy support in connection with the planned installation of the new cremators, mercury abatement and heat recovery equipment at Dukinfield Crematorium. The consultancy support from NIFES would be for the initial phase of the Project i.e. the preparation of the specification and tender support.
- 4.2 NIFES is an independent organisation that is not influenced by any manufacturers, suppliers or third party providers. This allows NIFES to be able to offer completely impartial advice.
- 4.3 The proposal from NIFES following initial discussions would include the following:
- Review the individual needs of the crematorium considering cremation numbers and work practices.
 - Prepare an outline upgrading plan for the proposed work.
 - Although the responsibility for the tender actions will be with the Council, they will assist the client procurement team with the selection of tenderers and the preparation of the tender advertisement as required by the EU regulations.
 - Prepare a performance specification for the abatement plant and cremators based around the MF/1 Form of Contract
 - Assist with the tendering process for the work by answering questions during the tender period.
 - Assist the Council's procurement and evaluation team during the evaluation period by providing technical advice to help the selection team determine most the economically advantageous offer and arrive at the most appropriate purchasing decision.
- 4.4 The main criteria in terms of the technical specification will be to ensure that the contractor installs cremators and any associated abatement plant that is able to operate in compliance with the conditions detailed in the Environmental permit Q6045 Tameside Borough Council - Cremators Abatement Plant at Dukinfield Crematorium issued by the local Environmental Health Department. In general, these operational constraints will reflect the conditions outlined in the Secretary of State's Guidance Note PG5/2(04) 'Crematoria', which identifies the limits for pollutant emissions to air, for both abated and unabated cremators, as well as identify standards of secondary combustion zone performance, emission monitoring and reporting, chimney height and work practice.
- 4.5 In addition to these key operational criteria, the energy usage and reliability/aftercare services will be major factors.
- 4.6 The performance specification will be issued to design and build contractors; the design responsibility for the project will therefore remain with the contractor and not with the Council or NIFES and the performance specification will clearly state this to protect the Authority.
- 4.7 The overall programme of work for the whole contract will inevitably vary depending upon the final requirement of the crematorium and the choice of equipment supplier.

Procurement Mechanism

- 4.8 The procurement of the project will be where possible through existing framework contracts.

Procurement Risks

- 4.9 The risks associated with the delivery of the preferred option. Option 1, is the availability of suppliers/manufacturers being able to carry commence the project in May 2019 which could

have an impact on delivering the programme. The more that the start date of the programme is pushed back, the more disruption it would create to normal delivery of the bereavement service as it would result in work being carried out in a period which is generally busier for the service.

Procurement Project Plan and Timescales

Table 3: Procurement Plan

Preparation of documents including specification	30 days	October 2018 – in progress
Invitation to suppliers to submit bid	30 days	November 2018
Removal of seal	2 days	December 2018
Evaluation exercise	7 days	December 2018
Award and voluntary standstill period	10 days	December 2018
Meet with successful supplier	7 days	January 2019
Contract start		May 2019

5 FINANCIAL INVESTMENT REQUIREMENT

Table 4: Financial Case

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Recurrent budget						
One-off investment (capital or revenue)						
Full project		£2.5m				

Summary of forecast financial investment

- 5.1 Indicative costs are looking to be in the region of £2.500m for the above project. However, this cannot be confirmed totally until the tender process has been completed. If, from the tendering process, costs are significantly different, a further report will be produced.

Timescales and milestones

Preparation of documents including specification	30 days	October 2018
Invitation to suppliers to submit bid	30 days	November 2018
Removal of seal	2 days	December 2018
Evaluation exercise	7 days	December 2018
Award and voluntary standstill period	10 days	December 2018
Meet with successful supplier	7 days	January 2019
Contract start		May 2019

External Funding Sources

- 5.2 Replacement of cremators and auxiliary equipment does not attract external funding.

Financial Risks

- 5.3 Subject to approval, the project will be funded through the Council's Capital Programme. Indicative costs are looking to be in the region of £2.500m for the above project. However,

this cannot be confirmed totally until the tender process has been completed. If, from the tendering process, costs are significantly different, a further report will be produced.

6 PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING

Project Management, governance and reporting arrangements

- 6.1 The project will be managed by Operations and Neighbourhoods – Head of Design & Delivery along with the Head of Bereavement Services who will monitor the quality, timescales and budget control

Stakeholders and facilitators

- 6.2 Involved in the project will be NIFES consultants, Bereavement Services staff. The Head of Design and Delivery will be responsible for overseeing the delivery of the project.

Resources

- 6.3 NIFES consultants will writing up the specification. The procurement team will need to assist and guide on putting the contract out to tender through any existing frameworks, or through the Chest, STAR or OJEU

Delivery plan, milestones and timescales

- 6.4 This information will not be available until the tenders have been received during the procurement process.

Project monitoring

- 6.5 The project specification is currently being produced by National Industrial Fuel Efficiency Service Consultants, 'NIFES', and the delivery of the project will be delivered by the successful tender contractor. The works will be overseen by the Council's Design and Delivery team along with the Head of Bereavement Services who will be on site.

Contract Management

- 6.6 All external contracts will be managed by the Head of Design and Delivery

Risks and Contingency

- 6.7 Should the work be delayed and not be able to commence in May 2019 as per the procurement plan, there will be disruption to Bereavement Services. It is anticipated the project will take approximately 3 months to complete. If the project commences on site in May 2019, it should be completed by August 2019 at the latest. If the start date is delayed, it will inevitably mean that some of the work will be carried out during busier periods within the service, i.e.; September, October. The sensitive booking of funerals would be managed by Bereavement Services Staff should that occur.

Benefits realisation/post implementation review arrangements

- 6.8 The Council will measure the success of this business case.
- All equipment is working in accordance with the guidance and legal limits required.
 - That the project is delivered on time
- 6.9 That the equipment is fit for purpose and not in a good maintained state of repair.

Report to:	EXECUTIVE CABINET
Date:	24 October 2018
Executive Member / Reporting Officer:	Councillor Allison Gwynne- Executive Member, Neighbourhoods Emma Varnam- Assistant Director, Operations & Neighbourhoods
Subject:	REPAIR AND RESTORATION OF CEMETERY BOUNDARY WALLS
Report Summary:	The report provides information on the condition of the boundary walls within the Local Authority Cemeteries and demonstrates a programme to bring them back into a pleasing and safe condition.
Recommendations:	To support and recommend that the necessary repairs to the cemetery boundary walls, as highlighted in the report, are carried out.
Links to Community Strategy:	The scheme seeks to provide an improved safe environment to the Local Authority Cemeteries and for the residents of Tameside, thereby contributing to the continuing economic key priorities within the 2012-22 Tameside Sustainable Community Strategy.
Policy Implications:	Expenditure in line with financial and policy framework. To assist in delivering a balanced budget and support the sustainability of the local economy.
Financial Implications: (authorised by Section 151 Officer)	<p>A total of £0.200m was earmarked in the Capital programme in October 2017 for the Repair and Restoration of Cemetery Boundary Walls. This scheme was marked as business critical in the report to Executive Board in July 2018. This report sets out a request for £0.260m which is an increase of £0.060m that has been identified following an inspection by structural engineers. Section 3.15 shows the costs for preferred option 1 which is to complete works on the high and medium risk areas, with a detailed breakdown shown in Appendix 1. As shown in table 5, the full financial investment required would be in 18/19.</p> <p>Works have previously been carried out from revenue commitments but this has only been a temporary fix. The risk of not carrying out the repairs and restoration could result in jeopardising the safety of residents and aesthetics of the cemetery. In addition it would lead to on-going revenue costs. The works have been categorised into a hierarchy of urgency with Medium and High works being prioritised.</p>
Legal Implications: (authorised by Borough Solicitor)	The Council has legal duties at common law and under statute to take reasonable steps to secure the safety of structures under its control. In relation to boundary walls, these duties are owed to both visitors and employees in the cemetery and to those outside who might be affected. That

said the Council has to balance this against the overriding statutory duty to deliver a balanced budget, which means it is incumbent upon members with limited and reducing budgets to allocate resources to the highest priorities recognising we have insufficient funding to do everything required.

Risk Management :

The safety of all visitors to the cemetery and to pedestrians walking along the highways adjacent to cemetery boundaries is paramount. The Council have a statutory responsibility to ensure our assets (boundary walls) are kept in a safe condition. Ensuring no access out of hours to cemeteries is also important due to the risk of people tripping or falling when there are excavated graves or uneven ground.

Access to Information :

The background papers relating to this report can be inspected by contacting Mike Gurney, Head of Management and Operations



Telephone:0161 342 5181



e-mail: Michael.gurney@tameside.gov.uk

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Proposed Investment

- 1.1 This project is to carry out repairs to the cemetery boundary walls. All of the Council's 8 cemeteries have been inspected by structural engineers and a detailed analysis of the work required has been obtained. Over the years, piecemeal repair works have been carried out on the various boundary walls in order to meet our statutory obligations in providing a safe environment. However, these works have been carried out from revenue commitments within the existing budget and have always only been a temporary fix. The conditions of the walls are now in much need of more permanent, professional repairs.

Options for Investment

- 1.2 Option 1, which is repairing and making safe the boundary walls highlighted as High and Medium Risk at Ashton, Dukinfield, Hyde, Mossley and Mottram Cemeteries and carrying out limited masonry work on identified defects on alternative boundary protection such as metal railings and fencing at Audenshaw, Denton and Droylsden Cemeteries, is the preferred option as this will provide a solution to ensuring the boundary walls are repaired in a professional manner and in a managed timescale in order to ensure the safety of residents and to protect the aesthetics of the cemetery.

Project Delivery

- 1.3 The Council's Design & Delivery service may sub-contract out elements of the proposed works, if not all of the work. Local contractors will be given the opportunity to tender for the work and will be used wherever possible. The project will be managed by the Council's Head of Design and Delivery service. The supervision of the work would be carried out by the Council's structural engineers and where possible, the Council's Design & Delivery service.

Financial Investment Requirement

- 1.4 The total capital monies required to enable the work to be executed and to mitigate the medium to high risks to the Council will be £0.260m.

Project Management and Monitoring

- 1.5 The project will be managed by Operations and Neighbourhoods – Head of Design & Delivery along with the Head of Bereavement Services who will monitor the quality, timescales and budget control and report via the corporate procedures.

Conclusion

- 1.6 Following the long term concerns for the condition of the Local Authority Cemeteries boundary walls within the borough, capital funding is required to enable a programme of works to be undertaken to deal with those areas that have been highlighted as having the most high/medium risk to the Council. Due to the findings of an initial inspection being so far reaching, structural engineers categorised the findings into a hierarchy of urgency, indicated by the following categories, Low, Medium and High. The cost of repairs to rectify all the findings was £0.588m. However, all those classed as low risk have been taken out of this programme and therefore the costs required in repairing and restoring the remaining medium/high risks walls is £0.260m. If a low-risk defect is identified and rectified on a project as part of the high priority work then it will be completed during the high-risk repair.

Recommendation

- 1.7 That support is given for the programme of works as indicated in Option1 to repair and restore the boundary walls in the Council's cemeteries that have been identified as Medium/High risk in Ashton, Dukinfield, Hyde, Mossley and Mottram Cemeteries and to carry out the identified defects on alternative boundary protection such as metal railings and fencing at Audenshaw, Denton and Droylsden Cemeteries through £0.260m of capital expenditure.

2.0 PROPOSED INVESTMENT

Background and Existing Arrangements

- 2.1 Tameside Council is responsible for the upkeep and management of 8 cemeteries within the borough.
- 2.2 The cemeteries managed by Tameside Council are:
- Audenshaw
 - Ashton (Hurst):
 - Denton
 - Droylsden
 - Dukinfield
 - Hyde
 - Mossley
 - Mottram
- 2.3 Nearly all of the above cemeteries were opened in the late 1800's. The oldest cemetery managed by the Council is Mottram Cemetery, which opened in 1861 and is still being used today for interments in new graves, as are all the other sites.
- 2.4 Cemeteries are often highly valued by communities for their spiritual as well as place-making and place-marking qualities. Tameside Council has adopted the "Charter for the Bereaved", which is an industry initiative to encourage best practice in cemetery maintenance and management and expects the Local Authority to demonstrate proper respect for the rights of the bereaved and for all visitors to the cemeteries.
- 2.5 The footfall of visitors to some of the above cemeteries shows that the sites are amongst the top most visited locations across the borough with Dukinfield Cemetery having approximately 500,000 visitors annually.
- 2.6 The boundary walls not only define the perimeters of the burial sites, but act as a deterrent on keeping visitors out during closing hours. Cemeteries are potentially dangerous places with many large memorials, excavated open graves and uneven ground. Good, secure boundary walls, along with locked gates, minimises the risk of injury by preventing access
- Why are we proposing to do this?**
- 2.7 The Local Authority has a general duty under The Local Authority Cemeteries Order 1977 to maintain their burial grounds in good order.
- 2.8 In addition, they have responsibilities under the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974 and The Management of Health and Safety at Work (MHSW) Regulations 1999.
- 2.9 The Local Authority is required to do all that is reasonably practicable to ensure that visitors and those working in its cemeteries are not exposed to risks to their health and safety.
- 2.10 The walls of the cemeteries border many different properties or locations owned by varying agencies or land owners. Some border the highway, others public footpaths, right of ways or bridle paths, whilst some border private residential or business properties. The Local Authority therefore has a duty to ensure that it is not exposing itself to risk and claims from others.
- Existing Funding Arrangements**
- 2.11 The net 2018/2019 income budget is for Bereavement Services is £1.281m. The income which Bereavement Services brings in contributes to the overall budget of Operations & Neighbourhoods Directorate in ensuring that, as a team, we balance the budget.

Options not considered

- 2.12 The closing of the cemeteries or public highways adjacent to the cemeteries where the medium/high risk walls were identified could not be considered.

Low Cost Options

- 2.13 There are no low cost options in dealing with this repair and maintenance programme.

Business Needs/Council policies, strategies and plans

- 2.14 The Council has to continue to operate its 8 cemeteries to meet the demands and needs of bereaved families. The Council has a statutory duty to ensure that the cemeteries and public highways are a safe place for its residents to visit and for any employees who work there. The Council is committed to providing a safe environment for all. Tameside Council's Bereavement Services is also committed to the '*Charter for the Bereaved*' which stipulates that residents have the right to visit their loved ones in a safe environment.

Regional and national policies, strategies and plans

- 2.15 Tameside Council's Bereavement Services is committed to the '*Charter for the Bereaved*' which stipulates that residents have the right to visit their loved ones in a safe environment.

Benefits

- 2.16 The benefits are covered in each of the options

Spending Objectives

- 2.17 The successful outcome can be summarised as below.
- That all the medium/high risk dangerous boundary walls are safe and are not at risk of injuring members of the public and therefore eliminating any potential claims against the council for injury or worse by spending £0.260m.

Risks

- 2.18 Risks are covered in each of the options.

Scope

- 2.19 The scope covered all the Councils Municipal Cemeteries as listed in 2.1.1. However, of the 8 cemeteries inspected, it was decided that the boundary walls at just 5 cemeteries, Ashton (Hurst), Dukinfield, Hyde, Mossley and Mottram cemeteries were in need of the most significant repairs. It was felt that Audenshaw, Denton and Droylsden cemeteries had limited masonry defects or alternative boundary protection such as metal railings/fencing and repairs required at these 3 sites was therefore minimal.

- 2.20 For each of the 5 Cemeteries highlighted as the most in need of work being required, detailed defects have been noted and marked on location plans for each site.

- 2.21 Defects recorded included:

- Missing stonework or coping stones
- Cracks in masonry
- Wall out of plumb and leaning with varying degrees of lean recorded
- Sections of walls missing
- Total rebuilds required
- Urgent pointing
- Deep voids under walls

Constraints

- 2.22 There are no obvious constraints on this programme of works.

Dependencies

- 2.23 The delivery of the project is dependent on the qualified stonemasons available to carry out the proposed works.

3.0 Options for Investment
Do Nothing

Summary

3.1 This option would mean the council would be leaving itself exposed to potential insurance claims for injuries or worse from members of the public. The boundary walls would deteriorate if not dealt with soon, resulting in significant more financial resources being required to rectify the issue. The aesthetics of the cemetery would soon fall into disrepair and access into the cemeteries through damaged walls would be easy for all, creating additional safety risks to visitors wandering around unlit operational cemeteries.

Benefits

3.2 The only benefits of taking this option would be that the Council would not have to draw down monies from the Council's capital funding. .

Risks

Risk	Likelihood	Outcome/impact	Mitigation
Walls collapse	High	Access to dangerous cemetery environment	Provide 24 hr security at huge costs
Walls collapse on someone	High	HSE investigation/prosecution	Close cemeteries
Walls deteriorate	High	Injury or worse to public	Close cemeteries

Cost

3.3 There are no costs associated by not carrying out a programme of works. However, should any person be injured or worse, an investigation and potential prosecution could arise and may cost the Council in both financial and reputational terms.

Wider impacts

3.4 The Council would be exposing itself to criticism should the works to repair the boundary walls not be carried out.

Option 1

Summary

3.5 This option would mean that the boundary walls identified as Medium/High risk at 5 of the boroughs 8 cemeteries would be repaired and made safe. These are Ashton (Hurst), Dukinfield, Hyde, Mossley and Mottram cemeteries. The inspection of the remaining 3 cemeteries, Audenshaw, Denton and Droylsden requires limited masonry work on identified defects or on alternative boundary protection such as metal railings/fencing. The substantial upgrading of metal work and local repointing works work at these 3 cemeteries has therefore been factored into the programme. As a result, at the completion of the proposed programme, the boundary walls at all 8 cemeteries will be safe.

Benefits

- 3.6 The following are the benefits of taking this option.
- Removing or reducing risks of insurance claims against the Council
 - Improving the environment
 - Preventing injury or worse to members of the public or employees
 - Complying with statutory Health & Safety legislation
 - Maintaining the aesthetics of the cemeteries
 - Minimising the need for significant more expense in the future.

Risks

3.7 There are no risks associated with Option 1.

Cost

- 3.8 Due to the findings of an initial inspection being so far reaching, structural engineers categorised the findings into a hierarchy of urgency, indicated by the following categories, Low, Medium and High. The cost of repairs to rectify all the findings was £0.588m. However, all those classed as low risk have been taken out of this programme and therefore the costs required in repairing and restoring the remaining medium/high risks walls is £0.260m.

Wider impacts

- 3.9 The Council would be complying with its duty in ensuring the cemeteries are a safe environment for the public to visit. The residents of the borough will see that the Council is committed to ensuring a safe environment for all.

Option 2

Summary

- 3.10 Option 2, (repairing all cemetery boundary walls whether highlighted as Low, Medium or High risk) would mean that the boundary walls at all of the boroughs 8 cemeteries would be repaired and made safe. However, £0.328m shown within Option 2 was identified by structural engineers as LOW risk as detailed in **Appendix 1**. These low risk areas can be regularly monitored over future years and a further report brought when and if the risk from these areas increase.

Benefits

- 3.11 The following are the benefits of taking this option.
- Removing or reducing risks of insurance claims against the Council
 - Improving the environment
 - Preventing injury or worse to members of the public or employees
 - Complying with statutory Health & Safety legislation
 - Maintaining the aesthetics of the cemeteries
 - Minimising the need for significant more expense in the future.

Risks

- 3.12 There are no risks associated with Option 2.

Cost

- 3.13 For Option 2, the cost of repairs to rectify all the findings Low, Medium and High Risk as identified by the structural engineer's survey was £0.588m.

Wider impacts

- 3.14 The Council would be complying with its duty in ensuring the cemeteries are a safe environment for the public to visit. The residents of the borough will see that the Council is committed to ensuring a safe environment for all.

Summary/Preferred Option

Table 7: Summary of Options

- 3.15 Option 1, which is to repair and restore the boundary walls where structural engineers have highlighted them as High and Medium Risk is the preferred option. This also means that work, albeit some minor, will be carried out at all of the borough's 8 cemeteries. Going with Option 1 means that it is only the low risk repairs to the boundary walls that will not be included in the work programme.

	Do Nothing	Option 1 Repair and restore boundary walls High & Medium Risk (Costs shown)	Option 2 Repair and restore boundary walls High, Medium AND Low Risk (Cost shown)
Spending Objectives (see 2.1.9):			
Ashton repairs	x	√ £19,450	£25,650
Dukinfield repairs	x	√ £67,500	£374,500
Hyde repairs	x	√ £65,300	£76,800
Mossley repairs	x	√ £41,450	£43,950
Mottram repairs	x	√ £26,300	£27,550
Repairs at Audenshaw, Denton & Droylsden	x	√ £40,000	£40,000
		£260,000	£588,450
Summary	Discounted	Preferred	Discounted

4.0 Project Delivery

Background

4.1 All of the borough's 8 Cemeteries have been jointly inspected by Head of Bereavement Services and Structural Engineers for Tameside Council to establish an initial scope of the proposed works needed. For each of the 5 Cemeteries highlighted as the most in need of work being required, detailed defects have been noted and marked on location plans for each site. See Appendices

Procurement Mechanism

4.2 The supervision of the boundary walls work programme would be carried out by the Council's structural engineers and where possible, the Council's Design & Delivery service.

4.3 The Head of Design & Delivery service may sub-contract out elements of the proposed works, if not all of the work. Local contractors will be given the opportunity to tender for the work and will be used wherever possible.

Procurement Risks

4.4 The risks associated with the delivery of the preferred option are that inclement weather may delay the work being completed as per any set timescales or the availability of stonemasons could have an impact on delivering the programme within this financial year.

Procurement Project Plan and Timescales

4.5 It is anticipated that the work identified in the preferred Option, Option 1 will be completed at all sites by the end of this financial year 2018/2019.

5.0 Financial Investment Requirement

Table 1: Financial Case

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Recurrent budget						
One-off investment (capital or revenue)						
Repair Cemetery Boundary walls	£260K					

Summary of forecast financial investment

- 5.1 The total capital monies required to enable the proposed work in the preferred Option, Option 1, to be executed and to mitigate the most urgent risks to the Council will be £260,000. See below.

RISK	BUDGET COSTS
Medium Risk	£102,650
High Risk	£117,350
Other associated costs	£40,000
	£260,000

Timescales and milestones

- 5.2 It is anticipated that the works will be completed in this financial year 2018/2019.

External Funding Sources

- 5.3 Repairs and restoration of the Cemetery boundary walls does not attract external funding.

Financial Risks

- 5.4 The financial risks are that costs may rise should any vandalism occur to boundary walls that have currently been declared as safe.

6.0 PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING.

Project Management, governance and reporting arrangements

- 6.1 The project will be procured and project managed by the Council's Design and Delivery Service. The Service will ensure that all contractors are compliant, and manage each procurement package in line with best practice.

Stakeholders and facilitators

- 6.2 The Head of Design and Delivery will be responsible for overseeing the delivery of the project. Council Structural Engineers will be involved in this project along with contractors who are awarded the various aspects of the programme.

Resources

- 6.3 The design and delivery team will be providing resources to deliver this programme of work.

Project monitoring

- 6.4 Regular monitoring and reporting will be provided to the Capital Monitoring Group and Strategic Capital Group.

Contract Management

- 6.5 All external contracts will be managed by the Head of Design & Delivery and will be mainly delivered through the Engineer's existing framework contracts.

Risks and Contingency

- 6.6 There are no significant procurement risks associated with the delivery of the preferred option as the design skills and construction deliverables are within framework contracts already in place.

APPENDIX 1

Ashton Cemetery Wall Repairs January 2018

Number	Defect	Action	Budget cost	Urgency
1	Wall leans 80mm and movement of wall	Rebuild top 1m 900mm long	£750	H
2	Fence moving really loose	fix fence 3.5m	£200	H
3	Wall leans 140mm and movement of wall	Rebuild top 1m 900mm long	£650	H
4	Wall leans 80mm	Rebuild top 1m 900x900mm on plumb (L Shaped pier)	£950	M
5	Wall leans 100mm	Rebuild top 1m	£600	M
6	Wall leaning	Repoint Pier 900x900mm out of plumb	£350	M
7	Wall leans 80mm and Cracking	Rebuild top 1.2 mm	£650	M
8	Missing stones under coping	Replace missing stones	£350	L
9	Wall leans due to Tree root	Remove Trees?	£2500	M
10	Missing Coping	Replace Coping	£350	L
11	Missing Coping	Replace Coping & rebuild top 3 stones	£350	L
12	Missing Coping	Replace Coping	£350	L
13	Missing Coping	Replace Coping	£350	L
14	Missing Coping	Replace Coping	£350	L
15	Missing Coping & Stonework	Replace Coping & 2 Stones need replacing	£450	L
16	Missing Coping	Replace Coping & Rebuild top 900mm(60mm out of plumb)	£750	L
17	Missing Coping & Missing stonework	Replace Coping & Replace 1 stone	£450	L
18	Steel Fence Irregular Approx 10m	Secure steel fencing	£1050	M
19	Missing Coping	Replace Coping	£350	L
20	Missing Coping	Replace Coping	£350	L
21	Missing Coping 120mm leaning	Rebuild top 1m 900mm long additional	£1200	H

		stonework 350mm out of plumb all of and Replace Coping		
22	Missing Coping	Replace Coping	£350	L
23	Missing Coping	Replace Coping	£350	L
24	Missing Coping	Replace Coping	£350	L
25	Missing Coping	Replace Coping	£350	L
26	Missing Coping	Replace Coping	£350	L
27	Missing Coping, 120mm leaning (Old Stump)	Rebuild pier 1m & rebuild wall either side 5+4m and Replace missing Coping	£3900	H
28	Pier leaning & wall from Pier to Pier leaning Approx 12m	Rebuild top of piers 1m and reconstruct wall 12m from pier to pier	£3000	H
29	Missing stonework	Rebuild Missing stonework 3x0.6m	£250	M
30	Missing stonework	Rebuild Missing stonework	↕	M
31	Wall Missing Stonework	Reconstruct wall 4m (on the face of the wall)	£850	H
32	Missing Stonework	Rebuild Missing Stonework 6 stones	↕	H
33	Wall leaning 100m	Rebuild top 1m 900mm long pier	£650	M
34	Missing stonework	Replace missing stonework 3 stones	£550	M
35	Missing Fence	Replace Fence 7m	£900	M
36	Pier leaning	Repoint end pier 1.8 x 0.9m (L shaped pier)	£450	M
Total cost			25650	

Dukinfield Cemetery Wall Repairs January 2018

<i>Number</i>	<i>Defects</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Budget cost</i>	<i>Urgency</i>
1	Missing stonework & copings	Localised repairs required for missing stonework, copings and pointing below coping and at footpath level	£3500	M
2	50mm wall leaning and cracking (next to tree)	Rebuild top 1m	£1200	H
3	70mm leaning wall	Rebuild top 1m	£1200	M
4	Wall out of plumb	Rebuild top 0.5mx4m	£1000	H
5	Wall out of plumb	Rebuild 20m long up to gate. 100mm plus out of plumb	£16,000	H
6	Wall needs attention	Make good top 0.5m, localised repairs required and repointing	£2000	H
7	Localised repointing	Localised repointing	£1000	L
8	Localised repointing	Localised repointing	£1000	L
9	Localised repointing	Localised repointing	£1200	L
10	Wall leaning and missing coping	Rebuild wall top 1m and 4m long and replace coping	£1600	H
11	Wall is 100mm out of plumb	Rebuild top 1.5m over 30m long	£25,000	H
12	Missing stonework	Replace stonework	£500	L
13	Missing Stonework wall damaged	Rebuild low level wall 600mm high	£1500	L
14	Missing stonework	Replace stonework	£500	L
15	Wall leaning 3.5m long and missing stonework (Tree behind wall)	Rebuild 3.5m wall 900mm high	£2000	M
16	Wall leans leaning (Tree and another wall behind face wall)	Remove tree and rebuild 5m long wall 1.5m high	£5000	M
17	Missing stonework	Replace stonework	£500	L
18	Pier leaning	Rebuild 900mmx1m high		M

19	Wall leaning 90mm 10m long and missing stonework	Localised Rebuild whole of wall 20m long	↑	H
20	Wall leaning 120mm and missing stonework	Rebuild top 1m and replace missing stonework	£5000	H
21	Missing coping and stonework	Replace coping and missing stonework	↓	L
22	End of wall missing	Rebuild end wall with remaining stonework, 8m long and return to brick boundary wall	£2000	M
23	Wall leans 90mm and has a gap between one wall and another.	Build a Buttress 2.4 m high 660mm long (Neighbours tree to be removed?)	£2000	H
24	Missing stonework and pointing defects in Car park	Localised Repointing required in Visitors Car park	£800	L
25	Defects along cemetery walls on the Park Rd Boundary with businesses	Reconstruction of the retaining structures along the edge of the cemetery on the Park Rd Boundary with businesses	£300,000	L
TOTAL			£74500 +£300,000	

Hyde Cemetery Wall Repairs January 2018

<i>Number</i>	<i>Defect</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Budget cost</i>	<i>Urgency</i>
1	Up to Rowan St., Low Wall 1.2m high leans 75mm, 15m	Monitor or consider rebuild	£8500	M
2	Rowan St Wall leaning 120mm 4m long	Rebuild wall 4m long	£3000	M
3	Knight Street Wall leaning on the lower wall 40mm	Rebuild lower wall 3m 1m high	£2500	M
4	High wall leaning 90mm	Rebuild wall 12m Long 2m high	£13000	H
5	Cracking in corner of wall at the back of the houses.(No Peel Street) This length of wall, at the back of houses on Peel St. needs further detailed inspection from house side	Rebuild 5m 2m high at corner. Allow for further rebuilding where access available to check from 5 to 6.	£5000 £15,000	M
6	Wall leaning 170mm	Rebuild 6m long + 1m high	£6000	H
6a	Gate hinge and side member on gate is damaged preventing safe operation	Steel gate repairs	£2500	H
7	Fence missing poles	Replace missing vertical rails in fence.	£1500	M
8	Lower wall is bulging out	Rebuild wall 3m+2m	£5000	L
9	Pier needs repointing	Repoint Pier top 2m	£800	M
10	Lower wall is bulging out	Rebuild lower wall 2+2+1m	£5000	L
11	Pier needs repointing	Repoint pier top 1m	£400	M
12	Pier needs repointing	Repoint pier top 1m	£400	M
13	Lower wall Bulging out	Local rebuild 2m long	£1500	L
14	Pier needs rebuilding	Rebuild top 0.5m of pier	£1000	M
15	Pier needs rebuilding	Rebuild top 1.5m of pier	£1500	M
16	Pier needs rebuilding	Rebuild top 1m of pier	£1200	M
17	Pier needs rebuilding	Rebuild top 1.5m of pier	£1500	M
18	Pier needs rebuilding	Rebuild top 1.5m of Pier	£1500	M
Total			£76800	

Mossley Cemetery Wall Repairs January 2018

Number	Defect	Action	Budget Cost	Urgency
1	3m long, 1m deep void under wall	Carefully remove any loose brick and Reconstruct brickwork foundation	£3000	M
2	Wall leaning	Take wall down 1.5m down and 20m long	£20,000	H
3	Wall leaning	Take wall down 1m and rebuild	£1000	L
4	Wall leaning	Rebuild stone wall either side of corner	£1500	M
5	Uneven wall	Rebuild top 900mm (5mlong)	£1500	M
6	Wall leaning	Rebuild top 600mm (15mlong)	£2000	M
7	Wall leaning	Rebuild top 600mm (4m long)	£1200	M
8	Stonework missing	Reconstruct stonework under Coping 10m long	£750	M
9	Stonework missing	Rebuild stonework top of wall 5m long (V-shape)	£1000	M
10	Stonework missing	Rebuild Stonework top of wall 10 long (V-shape)	£1500	M
11	Stonework missing	Rebuild top section of wall including coping (8m long)	£1500	L
12	Leaning/ cracked masonry Regents Drive	Rebuild local defects and re-point where required	£9,000	M
Total			43,950	

Mottram Cemetery Wall Repairs January 2018

<i>Number</i>	<i>Defects</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Cost</i>	<i>Urgency</i>
1	Missing stonework and leaning wall	Rebuild wall 900mm high by 3m long	£1750	M
2	Missing coping	Replace coping	£200	L
3	Steel gate needs repair	Restore steel gate	£450	M
4	Wall leaning 20m to the bend	Rebuild wall	£7,000	M
5	Wall leaning 250mm and cracking	Rebuild corner of wall next to the tree 5m	£4000	H
6	Missing stonework	Local repairs to restore stonework & repoint coping 10m long	£2000	M
7	Missing Coping and loose stonework	Replace coping 750mmx750mm Rebuild pier	£750	H
8	Rotten Lychgate both post.	Repairs to the Lychgate will be required	£2750	H
9	Missing stone work	Localised repairs are required	£1000	L
10	Missing stonework	Locally build wall 1mx1m	£600	M
11	Stonework missing between the wall numbers (GL 1&2&3)	Local repairs to replace missing stonework	£1000	M
12	Missing stonework	Replace stonework	£700	M
13	Missing masonry on the back face 1m long 0.5m below coping	Rebuild missing masonry	£300	M
14	Missing coping end of wall	Replace missing coping	£50	L
15	Damaged coping near the steps on the pillars	Repairs are required to both copings	£1000	M
16	Surfacing and drainage needs redesigning in large near steps	Resurface and clean or augment drainage provision	£4000	H
TOTAL			27550	

This page is intentionally left blank

Report To:	EXECUTIVE CABINET
Date:	24 October 2018
Executive Member / Reporting Officer:	Councillor Allison Gwynne – Executive Member, Neighbourhoods Emma Varnam – Assistant Director, Operations and Neighbourhoods
Subject:	STRATEGIC TRANSPORT REVIEW – REPLACEMENT OF COUNCIL FLEET VEHICLES
Report Summary:	<p>The Council currently operates a varied fleet of 164 vehicles of varying types from vans to refuse vehicles to provide its numerous services to the residents of the Borough.</p> <p>Reports for the replacement of the fleet 2012, 2015 and 2016 (ratified at full council January 2017) have been approved. There are now 16 vehicles remaining that require replacing, these vehicles were kept on fleet for an additional 1-2 years past their original replacement due dates due to condition and mileage. Two of the vehicle are provided under contract hire arrangements due to expire during 2018</p> <p>It is now essential to the continued operation of services that the remaining 16 vehicles are replaced.</p> <p>This report sets out the business case for the replacement of these vehicles and identifies the requirement for the Council to have in place a Strategic Fleet Replacement Strategy to ensure that the Council can continue to deliver operational services directly</p> <p>The report also recommends that 9 of the 16 vehicles are replaced with ULEV (Ultra Low Emission Vehicles), namely electric vehicles together with associated charging facilities</p> <p>The options presented in this report represent the best value way of meeting the Council's needs and achieving a variety of options of savings available, whilst maintaining the operational efficiency of services.</p>
Recommendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) The authorisation for Transport Services to procure 14 of the 16 vehicles identified in the report via a competitive EU tendering process, replacing 9 diesel engine small vans with ULEV (Ultra Low Emission Vehicles) electric vans.(ii) The procurement of the necessary electric charging facilities as part of the fleet replacement exercise as set out in Section 4.5, Table 5 of this report.(iii) It is recommended that approval is granted for the purchase of the 14 vehicles detailed in the main body of the report to be purchased via an ear-marked reserve, and to tender for a new contract hire arrangement for the 2 vehicles remaining.(iv) A further report detailing a Medium Term Strategic Fleet Replacement Strategy is prepared for presentation to the Executive Cabinet.
Links to Community Strategy:	The purchase of the vehicles will enable the Council to continue to provide its services to the Citizens of the Borough

Policy Implications:

The purchase of the vehicles is an essential requirement for the Council to provide services to the community in a safe manner in line with its obligations as an operator of large goods vehicles.

Financial Implications:

(Authorised by the Section 151 Officer)

There is a financial appraisal of an electric vehicle versus a diesel vehicle, over a 5 year period, in **Table 1** of this report. The procurement of an electric vehicle is the favourable option in terms of value for money. The total cost of ownership comparison in the financial appraisal is:

- Electric vehicle - £14,110
- Diesel vehicle - £15,546

Cost to the Council

After factoring in the residual vehicle values into the financial assessment it is considered that the use of a Council ear-marked reserve represents best value, resulting in the total cost to the Council for replacing the 16 vehicles and charging points being:

- £240,834 capital cost for the purchase of 14 vehicles
- £19,280 capital cost for the purchase of the charging points.
- £56,000 revenue costs for the contract hire of 2 minibuses
- **£316,114** total estimated cost to the Council as listed in **Appendix 2**

Cost to the Services

- The 16 vehicles listed in this report support the operations a listed in **Appendix 1**
- The 16 charging point locations are detailed in **Table 3** of this report

The estimated annual cost to Services is £85,205; details are included in **Appendix 3**

Legal Implications:

(Authorised by the Borough Solicitor)

The purchase process will need to comply with the Council's Procurement Standing Orders and the Procurement Regulations and Local Government Transparency Code.

Risk Management:

Set out in the report - see Section 7.

Access to Information:

The background papers can be obtained from the authors of the report,

Alan Jackson, Head of Highways and Transport



Telephone: 0161 342 2818



e-mail: alan.jackson@tameside.gov.uk

Mark Ellison, Transport Services – Group Engineering Manager



Telephone: 0161 342 2758



e-mail: mark.ellison@tameside.gov.uk

1. BACKGROUND

Council Fleet

- 1.1 The Council operates a large and varied fleet of vehicles and equipment to enable it to provide core services to the citizens of the Borough. Through the works of the Strategic and Operational Transport Group, the Transport Fleet has reduced by 25.4% from 220 vehicles to 164 since 2011. The fleet is made up of vehicles of mixed ages and types, on an agreed programme of annual replacements.
- 1.2 Reports for the replacement of the fleet 2012, 2015, 2016 and 2017 have previously been approved. There are now 16 vehicles remaining that require replacing, these vehicles were kept on fleet for an additional 1-2 years past their original replacement due dates due to condition and mileage. Two of the vehicles are provided under contract hire arrangements due to expire July 2018
- 1.3 Of the 164 vehicles there are now 16 in urgent need of replacement after having their operational lives extended by a further two years, or their contract hire arrangement is due to expire.
- 1.4 This report details the business case for the replacement of the 16 fleet vehicles to support the delivery of Council services and in the future these will be included in the strategic overview identified below.
- 1.5 It is not practical or advisable to extend the period of ownership of these vehicles further due to increased maintenance cost, reliability issues (resulting in increased operational downtime and costs) and safety issues.

2 COUNCIL SERVICE PROVISION – STRATEGIC FLEET REPLACEMENT STRATEGY

- 2.1 In the identification of the Council's Fleet requirements consideration must be given to many factors. Fleet vehicles support the provision of both direct operational services to the public (for example refuse collection vehicles) and also support services (vans for IT support to out-stations).
- 2.2 Transport Services has discussed and continually challenges operational services managers to identify fleet savings. All of the vehicles listed for the replacement in this report have been identified by the managers of the service areas as essential for the operation of these services and equally as important, within funding envelopes to pay back the purchasing costs paid for via a Council ear-marked reserve.
- 2.3 Moving forward it is essential that the Council has a strategic framework for its continued fleet replacement programme.
- 2.4 As the final elements of the current replacement programme are now dealt with in this report, it is therefore recommended that a Strategic Fleet Replacement Strategy is prepared and submitted to Executive Cabinet for approval to ensure continued delivery of Council Services is supported.

3. COUNCIL FLEET, AIR QUALITY and ULEV (Ultra Low Emission Vehicles)

- 3.1 In light of the government's statement to ban the sale of diesel cars from 2040 and the current failings of UK cities to meet its air quality targets, it is prudent for the Council to consider this in its future fleet replacement programme.

3.2 The Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) together with the GM Mayor have produced an Air Quality Action Plan as part of the GM Strategy in order to meet Air Quality targets.

4. COUNCIL FLEET – ELECTRIC VEHICLES or DIESEL

4.1 In 2015 the Council purchased a fully electric Peugeot Partner Van in anticipation of this fleet replacement programme. The vehicle was trialled by all services that operate small commercial vans, all services tested the electric van and reported real benefits. However, it was only operationally viable for the following service areas

- Operations and Neighbourhoods-Pest Control 3 vehicles
- Operations and Neighbourhoods-Libraries 2 vehicles
- Digital Tameside ICT 1 vehicle
- Operations and Neighbourhoods- Engineering Operations 1 vehicle
- Governance and Pensions – Distribution/Messenger Services 2 vehicles

4.2 All services agreed in principle to having the vehicle replaced with electric vehicles. However, the main reservation was the availability of charging points.

4.3 The table below outlines the financial business case for the procurement of electric vans compared with the diesel equivalent. As indicated in Table 1 there is a financial business case over 5 years for the purchase of electric vehicles however the main justification will be the environmental benefits to carbon reduction, air quality and noise emissions.

Table 1 : - Electric Vehicle vs Diesel Financial Appraisal

	Electric Option Partner SE L1	Diesel Option Partner L1 BlueHDI 100 850kg
Basic Price	£22,550.00	£15,990.00
Total (Dealer) Discount:	15.5%	45.5%
Discounted price:	£19,054.75	£8,714.55
Plug-In Van Grant*	£4,573.14	* <i>Not Available</i>
Effective Purchase Price	£14,481.61	£8,714.55
Delivery & number plates	£507.50	£507.50
Vehicle Excise Duty	£0.00	£240.00
First Registration Fee	£55.00	£55.00
Total OTR Costs	£562.50	£802.50
Initial Capital Investment	£15,055.11	£9,517.05
Ongoing revenue Costs:		
Lifetime estimated fuel cost	£1,718.75	£6,492.07
Road Fund Licence (Years 2-5)	£0.00	£960.00
Maintenance (5 Years)	£1,346.88	£2,201.56
Total Revenue Costs	£3,065.63	£9,653.63
Cost of Ownership over 5 years	£18,109.74	£19,170.69
Residual Value 4 years	£4,000.00	£3,625.00
Total Cost of Ownership	£14,109.74	£15,545.69

Note The business case above is indicative only, prices and costs will fluctuate with market forces, also vehicle usage, prices are quotations outside of tender, a possible reduction in purchase price may be achieved following competitive tendering process.

4.4 In addition, the private sector looks to local authorities to be setting the scene for how services can be delivered using alternative means of propulsion, e.g. electric and hybrids. Options available on the market currently are limited but consist of those detailed below in Table 2.

Table 2 – Vehicle Propulsion Options

Fuel Type	Benefits	Limitations/Disadvantages
Petrol	Cleaner than diesel but still a fossil fuel	Still contributes to CO ₂ and negative air quality. Not currently available in commercial vehicles of 3.5ton and above
Diesel	Better fuel efficiency / lower overall fuel costs due to increased MPG than petrol	Higher harmful emission content PM and NOX. Limited future availability. Government intention to cease sale by 2040 Higher maintenance costs. Generally higher road tax than petrol
LPG (Liquid Petroleum Gas) /Petrol Hybrid	Lower emission content CO ₂ / PM and NOX Lower fuel costs due to lower fuel duty Lower road tax Dual fuel capability.	Limited refuelling availability. Smaller fuel tanks so less miles per fill up Less fuel efficient. High conversion costs.
CNG (Compressed Natural Gas)	Lower fuel costs. Lower emission content than petrol/diesel or LPG Abundant availability of resources (but limited geographically) Hybrid availability Lower road tax	Inadequate refuelling infrastructure in place at present Fuel efficiency is poor - less MPG than petrol or diesel More expensive to convert.
Electric	Zero based road tax Zero emissions so zero harmful content Less noise emissions Quieter with better driver ride comfort Recharging can be done from any 240v outlet Fast charge capability from designated charging points Cheaper to operate or run	Higher initial costs Limited recharging infrastructure limited range Takers longer to refuel Charge 30 minutes to 8 hours Limited choice, not all commercial vehicle types available at present.

4.5 Based on the financial appraisal, analysis of the benefits and advantages/disadvantages of current fleet availability, it is therefore recommended that the Council procures electric vehicles to replace the current 9 diesel vans.

5. ELECTRIC CHARGING POINTS

5.1 An additional piece of work to identify requirements for the procurement and installation of required charging points is detailed below, with Table 3 below indicating numbers of points and locations required.

Table 3 : Number of Charging Points Required

Service Area	Operational Location of Service	Charge points required
Operations & Neighbourhoods Pest Control	Dukinfield Cemetery/Crematorium	3
Operations & Neighbourhoods Libraries	Stalybridge Civic Hall	2
Digital Tameside ICT	To run operations from Tame Street	1
Operations & Neighbourhoods Engineering Operations	Tame Street Engineering DSO	2
Governance and Pensions Distribution/Messenger	To run operations from Tame Street	2
All Operations	All operations that require charging points may use proposed charging facilities at Transport Services-Tame Street	6

- 5.2 The intention to create charge points at Tame Street to support all services and future services that will operate the 9 electric vehicles for this replacement programme and to future proof for future replacement programmes.
- 5.3 It is envisaged that a total of 16 charging points will be required as a minimum.
- 5.4 It is recommended that 9 of the 16 vehicles, currently Peugeot Partner Vans (Small Car Derived vans) are replaced with 9 ULEV / fully electric vans.
- 5.5 The services operating the vehicles have been consulted and can operate their services using electric vans.
- 5.6 The Council has researched the availability of framework contracts and costs of electric charging points with TfGM and currently no framework is in existence.
- 5.7 The Council would require charging points to be installed at four locations, with numbers of individual chargers as specified in Table 3 above.
- 5.8 The basic requirements of a charging facility would include:
- Fast Charging
 - Universal vehicle charging
 - Ability to limit access to charging
 - Identification of power usage per vehicle
 - Vehicle performance information for the Transport Manager
 - Built-in diagnostics to show any issues with charging
 - Intelligent charging to ensure supply is not undermined.
- 5.9 The basic requirement to introduce a charging facility is the availability of a three phase 22kW supply.
- 5.10 The estimated costs associated with the installation of 16 charging units at four locations are detailed in Table 4 below.

Table 4 : Charging Point Installation Costs

Item	Cost per Item (£)	Number Required	Total Cost
Power Supply	2,000.00	4	8,000.00
Control Hub	660.00	4	2,640.00
Charging Units	840.00	16	13,440.00
Less Grant	- 300.00	16	- 4,800.00
		Total	19,280.00

- 5.11 These estimated costs are based on the Engineering Services Street Lighting team installing the electricity supplies and the purchase of the charging equipment with a three year parts and servicing warranty.
- 5.12 In addition a central government grant from the Office of Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) is currently available for up to 20 charging units and this is reflected in the table above.
- 5.13 It is, therefore, recommended that given the lack of availability of a suitable framework contract, the Council should commit to the investment in these charging points.

6 FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Historical Perspective

- 6.1 Consideration in the past for the makeup of the Council's fleet has been based on the requirements of service areas.
- 6.2 The Council has recently moved away from the more expensive option of lease hire to direct purchase via Prudential borrowing, resulting in significant savings to the Council.

Estimated Replacement Costs for Identified Vehicles

- 6.3 To replace the vehicles identified in **Appendix 1**, it is expected to cost the authority as per the breakdown below
- Purchase costs : 14 vehicles = **£240,834**
 - Two minibuses replaced via new contract hire arrangements
- 6.4 The purchase costs are taken from previous procurement 2017 and manufacturer quotations outside of a competitive tendering exercise.
- 6.5 It is anticipated that a reduction on these prices could be achieved through the tender process. However, the opposite must also be considered as manufacturing costs increase.
- 6.6 It is anticipated based on the prices above (as best as can be determined outside of a formal tender) that the actual cost to the Council will be as per **Appendix 2**.

Note:

The vehicles will have an operational life of 8 years with the exception of the ULEV Vans an anticipated life of 5 years has been applied to these vehicles. The borrowing / lease periods are designed to match operational lives of the vehicles and equipment.

- 6.7 The estimated cost of the installation of 16 charging points in locations detailed in Table 4 is **£19,280**.

Procurement

- 6.8 **Council Ear-marked Reserve** – The Council has a capital reserve available, which may be utilised for such purchases and the charges to service areas would include repayment to reserve either at cost or including a similar percentage to current borrowing rates.

Financial Summary - Costs to the Authority

- 6.9 After factoring in the residual vehicle values into the financial assessment it is considered that the use of a Council ear-marked reserve represents best value, resulting in the total cost to the Council for replacing the 16 vehicles and charging points being:

- £240,834 capital cost for the purchase of 14 vehicles
- £19,280 capital cost for the purchase of the charging points.
- £56,000 revenue costs for the contract hire of 2 minibuses
- **£316,114 Total estimated cost to the Authority as listed in Appendix 2.**

- 6.10 There is an expected residual value attached to the vehicles/equipment at the end of their operational lives of 4, 5 or 8 years. This value is anticipated to be circa £31,175. The receipts for the vehicles and equipment when sold will go to offset the purchase of future fleet replacements.

Cost to Services

- 6.11 The 16 vehicles listed in this report support the operations as listed in **Appendix 1**.
- 6.12 The 16 charging point locations are detailed in Table 3 of this report.
- 6.13 The estimated annual cost to Services is £85,205; details are included in **Appendix 3**.

7. Risk Management

The main risks associated with this decision are as follows:

Implications of Not Replacing Fleet Vehicles

- 7.1 Any extensions to the fleet age profile would put additional burden on maintenance provision; this would still result in increased vehicle down time.
- 7.2 As vehicle ages harmful emissions increase with engine wear further increasing air quality risks
- 7.3 Additional financial provision for short term replacement would be required.
- 7.4 Two of the vehicle on contract hire (adult services buses) will be out of contract and operating in contravention of Procurement Standing Orders.

Impact on Vehicle Availability and Maintenance

- 7.5 As vehicle lives are extended and worked harder, there will be an increase in breakdowns and additional off-road time for maintenance.
- 7.6 Vehicle down-time results in loss of productivity and efficiency of the workforce.
- 7.7 The increased vehicle downtime would inevitably lead to an increase in the use of short term rental vehicles to supplement the increase vehicle downtime this would come at a significant financial cost.
- 7.8 Although it is anticipated that improved prices will be achieved through the tender process it is not guaranteed and market forces may result in an increase purchase costs against the original quotes.

- 7.9 Further service reviews may identify a need to reduce overall their vehicle demand, and return one or more of the vehicles before the end of the borrowing /lease period. In this event, the service area may be subject to early return costs. These costs will be met by that service and will be calculated using the following process: The item returned early will be sold with the receipts of the sale going to offset the outstanding borrowing, the short fall (if any) will be recharged to the service returning the vehicle.
- 7.10 Residual values may not be realised as expected due to market conditions at the time of sale.
- 7.11 It is essential that a decision on this report is progressed quickly to allow build slots to be obtained as soon as possible as lead times for ULEV vehicles is high and if we are to continue to provide services the existing fleet cannot be relied up to support services indefinitely.
- 7.12 If authorisation to replace the 16 vehicles contained within this report is not given then
- If the Council decides to extend vehicle usage, again this would be against the advice of Transport Services as resources to maintain a fleet of this age is not available and its performance in delivering services would be significantly reduced
 - As vehicles lives are extended and worked harder, there will be a significant increase in breakdowns and additional off-road time for maintenance.
 - As vehicles lives are extended and engines wear, there will be a significant increase in harmful emissions.
 - Vehicle down-time results in loss of productivity and efficiency of the workforce.
 - Additional financial provision for short term replacement vehicles would be required.
- 7.13 The Council needs to consider its current plans for the delivery of operational services. To protect the Council, should any services be provided by an external supplier, provision should be made with the supplier to utilise any Council owned fleet to deliver services.
- 7.13 A summary of the risks, impact and mitigating factors are included in **Table 8**, below, divided into two categories, replacing or not replacing the fleet.

Table 8 : Risk Summary

Risk	Impact	Mitigating Actions	Outcome
Replacing Fleet			
Price increases	Additional Costs	Procurement processes	Subject to market forces
Reduction in Services	Possible fleet surplus	New Fleet – higher residual value	Risk minimised
Stopping of Services	Possible fleet surplus	New Fleet – higher residual value	Risk minimised
Service Provided by third party	Possible fleet surplus	Include in arrangements with provider to utilise Council Fleet	Risk minimised
Residual values	Cost shortfall	Subject to market forces	Still provides Council with cost effective option for fleet replacement
Delivery Times	Service delivery / safety	Early decision	Urgent action required
Not Replacing Fleet			
Impact on Service Delivery	Downtime / inefficiencies	Replace fleet	New Fleet
Impact on Air Quality	Increase in harmful emissions	Replace engines/ or fleet item	New Fleet
All vehicles require replacement next year	Cost/ safety	Replace fleet	New Fleet
Compliance with Procurement Standing orders	2 x vehicle out of contract under hire agreement	Replace under short term hire framework contract	Temporary solution only short term hire can be used from 1 day to 1 year.
Increased costs Servicing / Repairs Downtime Replacement hires Staff time	Increased costs Servicing / Repairs Downtime Replacement hires Staff time	Replace fleet	New Fleet

8 ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

Environmental Issues

- 8.1 9 of the 16 vehicles can be replaced with ULEV vehicle with zero emissions and no negative air quality impact.
- 8.2 Current fleet has an average age of almost 8½ years and operates on Euro 3 and 4 type engines. (Current requirement is Euro 6)
- 8.3 A replacement fleet would operate on Euro 6 engines. These would provide both improved fuel efficiency and a reduction in harmful emissions and improved air quality.

9 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.1 As set out at the front of the report.

APPENDIX 1

Items of Fleet Reaching End of Operational Life 2018/19

Vehicle Type	Numbers Required	Age 2018/19	Optimum Operational Life	General Duties
Peugeot Boxer 12 Seat Minibus	2	3	N/A Contract Hire	Learning Disabilities Transport
3.5T Luton Box Van T/L	1	8	8	Grounds Maintenance
Peugeot Partner SL1 1.6HDI	3	8	5	Pest Control
Peugeot Partner SL1 1.6HDI	2	8	5	Mail Delivery
Peugeot Partner SL1 1.6HDI	1	8	5	IT Services
Peugeot Partner SL1 1.6HDI	1	8	5	Site Supervision
Ford Transit 280 swb 115ps	1	9	8	House Bound Library Provision
Peugeot Partner SL1 1.6HDI	2	8	5	House Bound Library Provision
Ransome HR300T Out front 60/62inch rotary Ride on mower	3	4	4	Grounds Maintenance

APPENDIX 2

Cost Summary

Vehicle Type	Service Area	Est Costs	Borrowing	Total
3.5T Luton Box Van T/L	Operations and Neighbourhoods	£25,500.00		
Peugeot Partner SE L1	Operations and Neighbourhoods	£14,481.61		
Peugeot Partner SE L1	Operations and Neighbourhoods	£14,481.61		
Peugeot Partner SE L1	Operations and Neighbourhoods	£14,481.61		
Peugeot Partner SE L1	Messenger Services	£14,481.61		
Peugeot Partner SE L1	Messenger Services	£14,481.61		
Peugeot Partner SE L1	IT Services	£14,481.61		
Peugeot Partner SE L1	Operations and Neighbourhoods	£14,481.61		
Ford Transit 280 swb 115ps	Leisure Services	£22,000.00		
Peugeot Partner SE L1	Leisure Services	£14,481.61		
Peugeot Partner SE L1	Leisure Services	£14,481.61		
Ransome HR300T Out front 60/62inch rotary Ride on mower	Operations and Neighbourhoods	£21,000.00		
Ransome HR300T Out front 60/62inch rotary Ride on mower	Operations and Neighbourhoods	£21,000.00		
Ransome HR300T Out front 60/62inch rotary Ride on mower	Operations and Neighbourhoods	£21,000.00		
Total cost for 14 vehicles		£240,834.49		
Total cost for 16 Charging Points		£19,280.00		
Total Capital Investment		£260,114.00		
Peugeot Boxer 12 Seat Minibus	Adult Services	£28,000.00		
Peugeot Boxer 12 Seat Minibus	Adult Services	£28,000.00		
Total Revenue cost for 2 vehicles procured under a new contract hire agreement		£56,000.00		
Total		£316,114.90		

APPENDIX 3

Estimated Cost to Services

Vehicle Type	Service Area	New Annual Rental Costs 2018
Peugeot Boxer 12 Seat Minibus	Adult Services	£11,853.29
Peugeot Boxer 12 Seat Minibus	Adult Services	£11,853.29
3.5T Luton Box Van T/L	Operations and Neighbourhoods	£5,800.66
Peugeot Partner SE L1	Operations and Neighbourhoods	£4,402.10
Peugeot Partner SE L1	Operations and Neighbourhoods	£4,402.10
Peugeot Partner SE L1	Operations and Neighbourhoods	£4,402.10
Peugeot Partner SE L1	Messenger Services	£3,021.44
Peugeot Partner SE L1	Messenger Services	£3,021.44
Peugeot Partner SE L1	IT Services	£4,402.10
Peugeot Partner SE L1	Operations and Neighbourhoods	£4,402.10
Ford Transit 280 swb 115ps	Leisure Services	£8,190.23
Peugeot Partner SE L1	Leisure Services	£4,402.10
Peugeot Partner SE L1	Leisure Services	£4,402.10
Ransome HR300T Out front 60/62inch rotary Ride on mower	Operations and Neighbourhoods	£3,550.03
Ransome HR300T Out front 60/62inch rotary Ride on mower	Operations and Neighbourhoods	£3,550.03
Ransome HR300T Out front 60/62inch rotary Ride on mower	Operations and Neighbourhoods	£3,550.03
	Total	£85,205.15

Report To:	EXECUTIVE CABINET
Date:	24 October 2018
Cabinet Deputy/Reporting Officer:	Cllr Allison Gwynne, Executive Member, Neighbourhood Services Ian Saxon. Director, Operations & Neighbourhoods
Subject:	ENGINEERING CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2018/19 UPDATE
Report Summary:	The report is presented to Executive Cabinet to confirm approval for the recommendations in particular in relation to the virement of existing Growth Deal grants from Engineering Schemes to a single Vision Tameside scheme.
Recommendations:	To approve the schemes as per the Council's re-prioritisation of the capital programme and supporting business cases. To approve the virement of existing Growth Deal grants from Engineering Schemes to a single Vision Tameside scheme.
Links to Community Strategy:	The schemes within the 2018/19 Engineering Capital Programme seek to provide an improved and more sustainable highway related asset for the residents and businesses of Tameside, thereby contributing to a safe environment, continuing economic regeneration and contributing to a low carbon economy; key priorities within the 2012-22 Tameside Sustainable Community Strategy. Development of work on improving the walking and cycling infrastructure supports a healthier borough and a move away from the reliance on cars as the first choice of transport.
Policy Implications:	The proposed funding allocation supports the Council's Corporate Plan priorities around the Sustainable Community Strategy. It also supports the objectives of the Greater Manchester third Local Transport Plan and associated strategies thereby underpinning its aims and objectives at a regional and local level, including walking and cycling strategies, reducing congestion and improving air quality.
Financial Implications: (Authorised by the Section 151 Officer)	Section 7 of this report details 5 schemes totalling £1.373m funded by Growth Deal grant. Approval for the virement of this funding to support a single Vision Tameside scheme is sought.
Legal Implications: (Authorised by the Borough Solicitor)	The Council has a statutory duty to maintain adopted highways and highway structures for which it is the highway authority under section 41 of the Highways Act 1980. The Cabinet approve the programme within the budget set by Council and the Panel are required to monitor to ensure it is being delivered efficiently effective on time and within budget. Individual schemes need appropriate governance to implement and this report gives an update on a number of projects and governance arrangements.
Risk Management:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Failure to approve the proposed Engineering Capital

Programme will prevent the appropriate allocation of resources by the Authority.

A robust programme of works will be developed to ensure that the objectives underpinning the Department for Transport and other funding allocations will be met and at the same time meet the objectives contained in Tameside's Community Strategy.

- Inclement weather preventing commencement and completion of schemes.

A comprehensive programme of works will be agreed between partners to ensure completion by approved dates. However, should the programme not be achieved it may be necessary to arrange for any outstanding financial resources to be transferred into the following financial year.

- Inability of suppliers to deliver materials within a time frame to meet completion targets.

Whilst the Council's Operational Services and external contractors have access to many material suppliers, shortages of materials may necessitate alternatives to be substituted or approval will be sought to carry over the project into the following year for completion;

- The ability of the Council's own Operational Services or external contractor to implement the scheme in the current financial year.

This risk will be managed by ensuring that should Operational Services or the external contractor be unable to complete the works during the current financial year, approval will be sought to carry over the project into the following year for completion.

- Statutory procedures linked to certain schemes could delay implementation.

Should it be necessary approval will be sought to carry over the project into the following year for completion.

- Mayor's Challenge Fund Bids.

Failure to deliver the programme after securing funding will impact on the future success of bids from this source.

Access to Information:

The background papers relating to this report can be inspected by contacting the report author, Alan Jackson



Telephone: 0161 342 3916

e-mail: alan.jackson@tameside.gov.uk

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 1.1 This report provides an update on current project and schemes, including the governance currently in place and updates on business cases produced for identified business critical systems.

2. HIGHWAYS TAMESIDE ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN (TAMP)

- 2.1 The Tameside Highways Asset Management Plan for 2017-2021 identified proposals to invest £20m in the Council's highways over a 4 year period from 2017/18 to 2021/22. The Strategic Planning and Capital Monitoring Panel in March 2017 supported the principle of additional investment in Highways subject to a further report alongside all other requests for funding. The October 2017 capital programme considered the relative priorities and agreed to fund £13.250m of the original £20m identified in the Highways Asset Management Plan, on the grounds that annual Highways Maintenance grant funding of £2-3m per year is anticipated. Against the £13.250m, approvals for expenditure totalling £8m have been sought for the 2 year period 2017/18 to 2018/19. A residual earmarked sum of £5.250m is included in the Capital Programme for 2019/20.
- 2.2 This funding was identified as being required, not only to reduce the risk of (further) deterioration to the highway network, but at the same time to bring about improvements to the overall condition of the highway, and provides opportunities to incorporate improvements to the network e.g. parking bays, crossing points, cycling facilities etc.
- 2.3 The annual Structural Maintenance Works programme (funded by Maintenance Block allocation of £1.695m from then Department for Transport) has traditionally, due to the limited resources available, been predominantly concerned with resurfacing. This has given little opportunity to bring about such improvements to the network.
- 2.4 The full programme for 2018/19 is included in **Appendix 1** with schemes completed to date highlighted in the table.
- 2.5 The earmarked funding for TAMP works in 2019/20 is £5.250m. As in previous years, details the programme will be provided for final approval at the start of the financial year, 2019/20
- 2.6 Support for the allocation of the £5.250m is sought in advance to ensure that the programme of improvements can be scheduled to achieve completion and any disruption to road users is kept to a minimum.

3. STREET LIGHTING - LED (LIGHT EMITTING DIODE) REPLACEMENT PROGRAMME

Minor Roads

- 3.1 In 2015, the Council approved capital funding for a LED Programme, to replace 17,000 street lamps on the Borough's minor roads in a 3 year investment programme of £5.00m.
- 3.2 This programme of improvements has been successfully delivered and an estimated annual savings of £0.426m, made up of a reduction in both energy and maintenance costs, has been achieved.

Major Roads

- 3.3 An additional investment by the Council to continue this programme to cover the major strategic and classified roads in the Borough for replacing street lights with LED lamps has been identified as business critical.

3.4 A full business case to the value of £3.600m has been prepared for presentation to Executive Board and Executive Cabinet in a separate report.

4. FLOODING – FLOOD PREVENTION AND CONSEQUENTIAL REPAIRS

4.1 The Strategic Planning & Capital Monitoring Panel on 9 October 2017 identified a £0.775m allocation for Flood Prevention and Repairs.

Repair of Consequential Damage

4.2 A sum £0.275m was identified to repair extensive damage that has occurred to a number of routes (roads, footpaths and bridleways) in the east of the borough as a result of the extensive flooding due to unprecedented rainfall associated with storms in November 2016 caused by Storm Angus.

4.3 Approval for £0.130m has previously been approved for these works.

Flood Prevention

4.4 A sum of £0.500m was identified to increase resilience against flooding from watercourses by a series of improvements to 10 of the priority Council maintained culverts and to improve Health and Safety requirements at these locations. Reducing the risk of flooding at these locations will protect both the Council's infrastructure and provide resilience for the community against flooding.

4.3 Detailed survey works and scheme designs for the identified culverts have been completed.

4.4 Flood Prevention and Repair of Consequential Damage has also been identified as business critical for the Council's capital prioritisation programme and a full business case has been produced for presentation to the Panel, seeking support for the approval of the remaining £0.145m for flooding repairs and £0.500m for flooding prevention.

4.5 A full business case to the value of £0.645m has been prepared for presentation to Executive Board and Executive Cabinet in a separate report

5. CROWDED PLACES

5.1 The Crowded Places Review explores improving the safety around schools and places of worship and work has commenced on a prioritised list of sites to identify improvements required.

5.2 An original sum of £0.250m was identified for these works. However, this has been put on hold, subject to the Council's re-prioritisation of the capital programme. A prioritisation business case framework has been produced and submitted, with options to;

- cease work on the project, with the cost of initial feasibility works being subject to a revenue pressure.
- complete the works identified to date at a cost of £0.110m.
- continue the programme to the value of £0.250m.

6. THE GM MAYOR'S CYCLING AND WALKING CHALLENGE FUND PROGRAMME

6.1 The Mayor's Cycling and Walking Challenge Fund (MCF), aims to kick start the delivery of the GM Cycling and Walking Commissioner's Made to Move report, and continue Greater Manchester's journey to becoming a city region where walking and cycling are the natural choices for shorter journeys, as set out in the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040.

- 6.2 The MCF is split into two funding pots, namely 'Active Centres and Corridors' and 'Active Neighbourhoods' and Tameside submitted bids to each of the pots.
- 6.3 The intention of the MCF is to invite proposals to be submitted on a 3 monthly basis and unlike many bidding funds, proposals can be re-submitted and amended to incorporate further improvements in subsequent bids.
- 6.4 Tameside's bid has been discussed with the Mayor's team and schemes which were given initial approval are listed at **Appendix 2**. Funding for these is subject to ratification by GMCA.

7. THE VISION TAMESIDE ASHTON TOWN CENTRE STREETScape IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

- 7.1 The Vision Tameside: Ashton Town Centre Streetscape Project (Turner Lane Junction and Wellington Road (Turner Lane to Camp Street)) aims to improve the Turner Lane Junction, with the existing traffic signal controlled junction being replaced by a roundel feature, wider footways and improved pedestrian crossings.
- 7.2 In addition, a vehicular free, wide vista linking the Clarendon Sixth Form College and new Shared Service Centre to the Market Square and wider town area is to be introduced, requiring the closure of Wellington Road between Turner Lane and Camp Street to through traffic.
- 7.3 This scheme would be funded by redirecting Growth deal grant funds from the following Growth Deal schemes, M60 J23 Pinch Point, Access to Ashton town centre, Ashton to Stalybridge, Access to Metrolink Stops and Ashton.
- 7.4 Total budget for this proposed scheme would be £1.373m, as identified in table below.

<i>Vision Tameside Aston Town Centre Streetscape Improvement Project</i>				
Proposed Project Ashton Public Realm- ENG 202				
Scheme	Description	Original Budget £	Proposed Changes £	Proposed 18/19 Budget £
ENG168	M60 J23 Pinch Point	359,000	-359,000	-
ENG169	Access to Ashton town centre	189,290	-189,290	-
ENG186	Ashton to Stalybridge	225,000	- 225,000	-
ENG203	Access to Mertolink Stops	300,000	- 300,000	-
ENG202	Ashton Public Realm	300,000	- 300,000	-
	Total of above schemes	1,373,290	- 1,373,290	
Total	Proposed VT Scheme			1,373,290

8. FINANCIAL CAPITAL MONITORING

- 8.1 The Quarter 2 Capital Monitoring will be undertaken at the end of September 2018. A verbal update on any major exceptions to plans will be provided as required.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.1 As detailed on the front page of this report.

APPENDIX 1

Highways Works Programme 2018/2019

(Completed or Commenced Schemes to date marked)

Ward	Road	From / To	Work
Audenshaw	Ashlands Drive	Full Length	Footway Micro
Audenshaw	Audenshaw Road	Manor Road to Manchester Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Audenshaw	Corporation Road	Egerton Street to Leech Brook Avenue	Carriageway Micro
Audenshaw	Enville Street	Guide Lane to Eldon Close	Footway Micro
Audenshaw	Enville Street	Guide Lane to Redmond Close	Carriageway Micro
Audenshaw	Guide Lane KRN	Water Street to Rail Bridge (L/C 5) inc. Bridge	Carriageway Resurfacing
Audenshaw	Hazelwood Drive	Full Length	Footway Micro
Audenshaw	Linden Avenue	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Audenshaw	Lumb Lane	Aldwyn Park Road to Manchester Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Audenshaw	Nelson Street	Full Length	Footway Micro
Audenshaw	Poplar Street	Full Length	Footway Micro
Audenshaw	Ravenwood Drive	Full Length	Footway Micro
Audenshaw	Redmond Close	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Audenshaw	Redwood Drive	Full Length	Footway Micro
Audenshaw	Shepley Road	Guide Lane to Cemetery Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Ashton Waterloo	Alt Hill Lane	Waggon Road to Fern Lea	Carriageway Micro
Ashton Hurst	Coronation Road	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Ashton St Michaels	Cottingham Drive	Full Length	Footway Resurfacing
Ashton St Michaels	Fountain Street	Mossley Rd to L/C 9 and Opp Side	Footway Resurfacing
Ashton St Michaels	Garden Walk	Full Length	Footway Resurfacing
Ashton Hurst	Green Hurst Road	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Ashton St Peters	Hill Street	Portland Street South to Cavendish Street	Carriageway Resurfacing
Ashton St Michaels	Hurst Brook Close	Full Length	Footway Resurfacing
Ashton St Peters	Katherine St	L/C 11 to Bentinck Street	Footway Resurfacing
Ashton Waterloo	Knowle Avenue	Richmond Street to Taunton Road	Carriageway Micro
Ashton Hurst	Lees Road	St Albans Ave to Green Hurst Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Ashton St Michaels	Lower Green	Full Length	Footway Micro
Ashton St Peters	Manchester Road KRN	William Street to Margaret Street	Carriageway Resurfacing
Ashton St Michaels	Middle Green	All except O/S 32-40 (flagged)	Footway Micro
Ashton Waterloo	Mill Brow	Old Mill to Dean Terrace	Carriageway Resurfacing

Ward	Road	From / To	Work
Ashton St Michaels	Montague Road	Mossley Road to Beaufort Road	Carriageway Micro
Ashton Waterloo	Newmarket Road	Oldham Road to Taunton Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Ashton St Peters	Park Parade	L/C 37 near Scotland Street to L.C 72	Carriageway Micro
Ashton St Michaels	Pot Hill	To Pub (one side) / G/E 40 (other side) inc. Pot Hill Square	Footway Micro
Ashton St Peters	Richmond Street	Katherine Street to Kenyon Street	Carriageway Resurfacing
Ashton Hurst	Rowley Street	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Ashton St Peters	Stockport Road	South Street to Birch Street	Carriageway Resurfacing
Ashton St Michaels	Sunnyside Grove	Full Length	Footway Micro
Ashton Waterloo	Tiverton Place	Full Length	Footway Micro
Ashton Waterloo	Watermill Court	Full Length	Footway Micro
Ashton Waterloo	Wilshaw Grove	Full Length	Footway Micro
Ashton Waterloo	Wilshaw Lane	Wilshaw Grove to R/O Jubilee Bridge	Carriageway Resurfacing
Denton South	Arlington Avenue	Full Length	Footway Micro
Denton West	Ash Road	Windsor Road to Thornley Lane North	Carriageway Micro
Denton South	Aylesbury Avenue	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Denton South	Beverley Ave	Full Length	Footway Micro
Denton South	Bowker Avenue	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Denton South	Clarendon Road	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Denton South	Dixon Road	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Denton South	Exeter Avenue	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Denton South	Fernley Ave	Full Length	Footway Micro
Denton South	Flemish Road	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Denton West	Hulme Road	Full Length	Carriageway Resurfacing
Denton North East	King Street	Full Length	Carriageway Resurfacing
Denton North East	Lake Road	Full Length	Carriageway Resurfacing
Denton South	Lancaster Road	Mancunian Road to Two Trees Lane	Carriageway Micro
Denton South	Lydgate Close	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Denton North East	Manchester Road North	Oldham Street to Seymour Street	Carriageway Micro
Denton South	Mancunian Road	Edale Road to Baslow Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Denton South	Moorfield Avenue	Full Length	Footway Micro
Denton South	Moorfield Avenue	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Denton South	Northstead Avenue	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Denton South	Portal Grove	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Denton North East	Queen Street	Full Length	Carriageway Resurfacing
Denton South	Silverdale Ave	Full Length	Footway Micro

Ward	Road	From / To	Work
Denton South	St Marys Avenue	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Denton South	Stockport Road	Cemetery Road to Scott Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Denton South	Strathmore Ave	Full Length	Footway Micro
Denton South	Sunningdale Road	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Denton South	Trowbridge Road	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Denton South	Warwick Avenue	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Denton South	West Park Ave	Full Length	Footway Micro
Denton South	Winchester Avenue	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Denton West	Windmill Lane	Windermere Rd to L/C 37	Carriageway Resurfacing
Denton South	Worcester Avenue	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Droylsden West	Ashdale Crescent	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Droylsden West	Ashley Road	Lewis Road to Lynn Drive	Carriageway Micro
Droylsden East	Ashton Hill Lane	Gorseley Fields to Market Street	Footway Micro
Droylsden West	Baslow Road	Full Length	Carriageway Resurfacing
Droylsden West	Cornwall Road	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Droylsden West	Dovedale Avenue	Full Length	Carriageway Resurfacing
Droylsden West	Edge Lane	Hamnett Street to Alderdale Drive	Footway Resurfacing
Droylsden East	Ellen Street	From No. 2 Trent Walk to No. 7 Lune Walk	Carriageway Resurfacing
Droylsden East	Ellen Street	Full Length	Footway Micro
Droylsden West	Greenside Crescent	Full Length	Footway Resurfacing
Droylsden West	Greenside Lane	Fiveways to Springfield Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Droylsden West	Hales Close	Full Length	Footway Resurfacing
Droylsden West	Hawkestone Avenue	Full Length	Carriageway Resurfacing
Droylsden West	Kelsall Drive	Full Length	Carriageway Resurfacing
Droylsden East	Kings Walk	Full Length	Footway Micro
Droylsden East	Lune Walk	Full Length	Footway Micro
Droylsden East	Mere Avenue	Full Length	Carriageway Resurfacing
Droylsden West	Peakdale Road	No. 20 to Haven Drive	Carriageway Resurfacing
Droylsden East	Ribble Walk	Full Length	Footway Micro
Droylsden East	St Andrews Avenue	Full Length	Carriageway Resurfacing
Droylsden West	Sunnyside Road	Cypress Road to 31 Sunnyside Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Droylsden West	The Crescent	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Droylsden West	The Quadrant	Full Length	Carriageway Resurfacing
Droylsden East	Trent Walk	Full Length	Footway Micro
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Abbey Road	Full Length	Footway Micro
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Ash Tree Drive	Full Length	Carriageway Micro

Ward	Road	From / To	Work
Dukinfield	Birch Lane	Birch View to No. 238 Birch Lane	Carriageway Resurfacing
Dukinfield	Boyds Walk	Birch Lane to King Street	Carriageway Micro
Dukinfield	Cheetham Hill Road	No. 212 to Yew Tree Lane	Carriageway Resurfacing
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Coronation Avenue	Full Length	Footway Micro
Dukinfield	Crescent Road	Astley Street to Town Lane	Carriageway Resurfacing
Dukinfield	Dean Court	Full Length (Adopted Section)	Carriageway Micro
Dukinfield	Dewsnap Lane	No. 120 to Armadale Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Dovestone Crescent	Full Length	Footway Micro
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Elm Tree Drive	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Fir Tree Lane	Gloucester Rise to Gorse Hall Road	Carriageway Micro
Dukinfield	Globe Lane	Globe Square to White Bridge	Carriageway Resurfacing
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Gorse Hall Road	Cheetham Hill Road to Lyne Edge Crescent	Carriageway Micro
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Greenbooth Close	Full Length	Footway Micro
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	High Street	Tame Street to Pine Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Dukinfield	Hill Street	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Dukinfield	Jubilee Avenue	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Dukinfield	Lodge Lane	Various F/W Lengths	Footway Resurfacing
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Lyne Edge Crescent	Lyne Edge Road to Yew Tree Lane	Carriageway Micro
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Lyne Edge Road	Yew Tree Lane to Gloucester Rise	Carriageway Micro
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Mountbatten Avenue	Full Length	Footway Micro
Dukinfield	Park Road	Crescent Road to Riverside	Carriageway Resurfacing
Dukinfield	Parkin Close	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Dukinfield	Peel Street	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Dukinfield	Poplar Road	Oak Tree Drive to Fir Tree Lane	Carriageway Micro
Dukinfield	Queen Street	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Queensway	Full Length	Footway Micro
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Redmire Mews	Full Length	Footway Micro
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Rowan Crescent	Full Length	Footway Micro
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Sycamore Close	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Water Grove Road	Full Length	Footway Micro
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Yew Tree Lane	From Water Grove Road to Lyne Edge Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Hyde Newton	Ashton Road	No. 53 to Talbot Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Hyde Newton	Bagshaw Street	Including Swindells Street (Both Full Length)	Carriageway Micro
Hyde Werneth	Bankfield	Full Length	Footway Micro
Hyde Werneth	Brabyns Road	Full Length	Carriageway Micro

Ward	Road	From / To	Work
Hyde Werneth	Brabyns Road	Full Length	Footway Micro
Hyde Newton	Carter Street	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Hyde Werneth	Carter Street	Full Length	Footway Micro
Hyde Newton	Commercial Street	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Hyde Werneth	Dannywood Close	Full Length	Footway Micro
Hyde Newton	Dow Street	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Hyde Werneth	Dow Street	Full Length	Footway Micro
Hyde Newton	Dukinfield Road KRN	Hyde Newton St to Nursery Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Hyde Werneth	Foxholes Road	Full Length	Footway Micro
Hyde Werneth	Gee Cross Fold	Full Length	Footway Micro
Hyde Werneth	Great Norbury Street	Railway Street to rail bridge	Carriageway Resurfacing
Hyde Werneth	Hudson Road	Full Length	Footway Micro
Hyde Werneth	Lord Derby Road	Full Length	Footway Micro
Hyde Godley	Lynton Walk	Hatts Rd West to G/E 14	Footway Resurfacing
Hyde Godley	Mansfield Road	Lumn Road to Walker Lane	Carriageway Micro
Hyde Newton	Markham Street	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Hyde Godley	Matley Lane	L/C 4 to Victoria Street	Carriageway Micro
Hyde Godley	Milverton Walk	G/E 11 to Lynton Ave	Footway Resurfacing
Hyde Newton	Park Road	Lodge Lane to Clarendon Street	Carriageway Micro
Hyde Newton	Queenhill Drive	Full Length	Footway Micro
Hyde Newton	Rydal Avenue	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Hyde Werneth	Silver Hill Road	Napier Street to G/E 24	Carriageway Resurfacing
Hyde Newton	Smith Street	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Hyde Godley	St Paul's Hill Road	No. 12 to Crossbridge Road	Carriageway Micro
Longdendale	Ashworth Lane	No. 57 to Market Place	Carriageway Micro
Longdendale	Back Moor KRN	Stalybridge Road to Mottram Moor	Carriageway Resurfacing
Longdendale	Chapman Road	Hattersley Road East to Stockport Road	Carriageway Micro
Longdendale	Ellison Close	Full Length	Footway Micro
Longdendale	Hattersley Road West	No. 175 (L/C 52) to Sandy Bank Avenue	Carriageway Resurfacing
Longdendale	Hawthorn Grove	Full Length	Footway Micro
Longdendale	Organ Way	Full Length	Footway Micro
Longdendale	Printers Fold	Full Length	Footway Micro
Longdendale	Rosebank Close	Full Length	Footway Micro
Longdendale	Spring Street	Full Length	Footway Micro
Longdendale	Spring Street	Full Length (Adopted Section)	Carriageway Micro
Longdendale	The Boulevard	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Hyde Godley	Underwood Road	Hattersley Road West to Wardlebrook Avenue	Carriageway Micro
Longdendale	Woodlands Close	Full Length	Carriageway Micro

Ward	Road	From / To	Work
Longdendale	Woolley Lane KRN	Mottram Moor to No. 85 (& S/O No. 9 to Bridge)	Carriageway Resurfacing
Mossley	Ash Hill Drive	Full Length	Footway Micro
Mossley	Beechwood Drive	Full Length	Footway Micro
Mossley	Cote Lane	Full Length	Footway Micro
Mossley	Crown Hill	Full Length	Footway Micro
Mossley	Dale Avenue	Full Length	Footway Micro
Mossley	Dalesfield Crescent	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Mossley	Denbigh Street	Full Length	Footway Micro
Mossley	Hollins Lane	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Mossley	King Street	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Mossley	Lees Road	No. 69 to Holly Bank Farm	Carriageway Micro
Mossley	Lower Hey Lane	Full Length	Footway Micro
Mossley	Manchester Road	Near Mill Lane	Footway Resurfacing
Mossley	Manchester Road KRN	Tame Valley Close to No 385 Manchester Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Mossley	Meadow Close	Full Length	Footway Micro
Mossley	Moorlands Crescent	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Mossley	Moorside Road	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Mossley	Queensway	Full Length	Footway Micro
Mossley	Regent Drive	Full Length	Footway Micro
Mossley	Staley Road	Derby Street to Cemetery Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Mossley	Station Road	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Mossley	The Rowans	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Mossley	The Sycamores	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Mossley	The Uplands	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Stalybridge South	Ashes Close	Full Length	Footway Micro
Stalybridge South	Ashes Lane	Full Length	Footway Micro
Stalybridge South	Blundering Lane	Matley Lane to Woodend Lane	Carriageway Micro
Stalybridge South	Burnside Close	Full Length	Carriageway Micro
Stalybridge North	Caroline Street	High Street to Market Street	Carriageway Resurfacing
Stalybridge North	Carrbrook Close	Full Length	Footway Resurfacing
Stalybridge North	Carrbrook Crescent	Full Length	Footway Resurfacing
Stalybridge North	Darnton Road	No. 19 to Astley Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Stalybridge South	Foxhill Drive	Full Length	Footway Micro
Stalybridge South	Hassall Street	Cecil Street to Mottram Road	Carriageway Micro
Stalybridge South	Heaps Farm Court	Full Length	Footway Micro
Stalybridge South	Huddersfield Road	No. 221 to No. 311 (Brushes Road to Parkfields)	Carriageway Resurfacing
Stalybridge South	Mottram Old Road	No 2 to Shutts Lane	Carriageway Micro
Stalybridge North	Oakfield Avenue	Full Length	Footway Resurfacing
Stalybridge South	Old Rd	Full Length	Footway Micro
Stalybridge/Dukinfield	Park Road	Tame Street to Clarence Street	Carriageway Micro

Ward	Road	From / To	Work
Stalybridge South	Quarry Clough	Full Length	Footway Micro
Stalybridge North	Rassbottom Street	Stamford Street to Market Street	Carriageway Resurfacing
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Tame Street	Depot Gates to Clarence Street (both sides)	Footway Resurfacing
Dukinfield/Stalybridge	Warrington Street	Acres Lane to Taylor	Carriageway Micro
Stalybridge North	Waterloo Road	Market Street to Trinity Street	Carriageway Micro
Stalybridge South	Wellbank	Full Length	Footway Micro
Stalybridge South	Woodend Lane	Blundering Lane to Mottram Road	Carriageway Micro

APPENDIX 2

The GM Mayor's Cycling and Walking Challenge Fund (MCF)

Tameside approved schemes, subject to ratification by GMCA

Town	Scheme Name	From / To	Description	Total Est (£'000s)
Ashton	Rayner Lane	Audenshaw Railway path to Lord Sheldon Way and Ashton Moss link	Surface existing footpaths, bridleways and low trafficked roads linking with existing facilities at either end and at Metrolink stop.	275
Ashton	Warrington Street	Warrington Street to Ashton interchange and train station	Contraflow, punch through x 2, route through pedestrian area	14
Denton	Ross Lave Lane	Stockport boundary at Reddish Vale to Town Lane	Improve surface to allow use for commuters. Crosses M60 and avoids use of Windmill Lane. Part of the TPT and NCN 62	440
Stalybridge	Stamford Drive/Currier Lane	Stalybridge to Ashton	Quiet Street Route and potential crossing of Clarence St	110
Ashton	Hill Street	Hill Street, Victoria Street to Trafalgar Square	Contraflow, junction improvements, punch-through x 2. Links with CCAG scheme.	220
Audenshaw	Clarendon Road	Clarendon Road punch through	Improve existing punch through to meet current design standards. Improve current CCAG route linkages	3.3
Stalybridge	Stamford Park	West Hill School, Astley Street, Stamford Park to Mossley Road	Link to school x 2 and hospital, quiet streets, traffic free route through park. Extension of CCAG route.	150
			Total Estimated Cost	1,212.3

This page is intentionally left blank

Report To:	EXECUTIVE CABINET
Date:	24 October 2018
Executive /Reporting Officer:	Members Councillor Oliver Ryan – Executive Member (Children’s Services) Gani Martins – Assistant Director of Children’s Services
Subject:	CORPORATE PARENTING UPDATE
Report Summary:	Provides update on the work and progress of the Corporate parenting Board.
Recommendations:	To note the improvements and progress in strengthening Corporate Parenting arrangements.
Links to Community Strategy:	Supporting vulnerable children and young people and fulfilling the council’s statutory responsibilities as corporate parents
Policy Implications:	Children Act 1989, Children and Social Work Act 2017. Looking after and protecting children and young people is one of the most important jobs that councils have to do and when a child can’t for whatever reason stay at home the council has to step in and give them the care support and stability they need. Corporate Parenting is an important part of OFSTED inspection Framework and was an area that was identified for improvement in 2016.
Financial Implications: (Authorised by the Section 151 Office)	There are no direct financial implications arising from the report.
Legal Implications: (Authorised by the Borough Solicitor)	<p>It is important that there is effective governance and oversight of service delivery in particular given the additional resources being provided to the service to ensure value for money being achieved.</p> <p>All councillors and senior officers are corporate parents and the role brings with it significant responsibility.</p> <p>The Children and Social Work Act 2017 says that a corporate parent means that they should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ act in the best interests, and promote the physical and mental health and wellbeing, of those children and young people✓ encourage them to express their views, wishes and feelings, and take them into account, while promoting high aspirations and trying to secure the best outcomes for them✓ make sure they have access to services✓ make sure that they are safe, with stable home lives, relationships and education or work✓ prepare them for adulthood and independent living. <p>As corporate parents, it’s our responsibility to make sure that the council is meeting these duties towards children in care and care leavers. The LGIU have issued some useful guidance at https://www.local.gov.uk/corporate-parenting-resource-pack</p>

Risk Management:

The Corporate Parenting Board was one of the areas that required significant improvement following the Ofsted inspection in 2016. It is there essential that the progress made is maintained through regular meeting and monitoring and update of the action plan and Strategy.

Access to Information :

Background papers relating to this report can be inspected by contacting :

Gani Martins, Assistant Executive Director (Interim) of Children's Services, Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council



Telephone:0161 342 4143



e-mail: gani.martins@tameside.gov.uk

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Children and young people in care are accommodated by the Local Authority because their own family are unable to meet their needs, either temporarily or in the longer term. The council has a statutory duty to provide for the child's needs in the way that a good parent would. It is therefore very essential that we collectively care about these children and young people as well as care for them. In order to make sure we meet this requirement we have reviewed and revised our Corporate Parenting Strategy and developed a comprehensive plan of how we will improve outcomes for our children and young people in care and ensure that our Care Leavers have the best chance to successfully make the transition into independence.
- 1.2 We aim to be the best kind of pushy corporate parents – always looking for the very best for our children, always looking for more opportunities and support for them above and beyond the basics, and always trying to get as much help as possible from the extended corporate family network.
- 1.3 At the beginning of September 2018 we are Corporate Parents to 634 children and 290 Care Leavers. Primarily our aim is to safely reduce the number of children in care and to support families so that more children are cared for within their family networks and more children move into permanent care through Special Guardianship Order. Whilst our Looked after Children number is still relatively high, we are however now seeing some short term stability in numbers emerging over the past three months.

2. UPDATE AND WORK COMPLETED SINCE JANUARY 2018

Corporate Parenting Group

- 2.1 The Corporate Parenting Group agreed a new Terms of Reference in January 2018 including revised membership and chairing arrangements. There are now clear monitoring and reporting arrangements with thematic feedback from objectives of Corporate Parenting Strategy Action Plan and evidence that we are making improvements in achieving positive outcomes for our Looked After Children.
- 2.2 To ensure the delivery of the Corporate Parenting Strategy and plan, three multi-agency Looked After Children and Care Leavers partnership groups was established so that as corporate parents we are continuously seeking to improve the full range of outcomes for our children and young people. These groups are:
 - Safeguarding and Stability Group
 - Health and Wellbeing Group
 - Education, Training and Employability Group
- 2.3 The groups meet on a monthly basis and are responsible for ensuring the actions in the Corporate Parenting Strategy are followed through, and progress reported into the Corporate Parenting Group.
- 2.4 Young people now attend the Corporate Parenting Group and make very valuable contribution to discussions during the meetings.
- 2.5 There have been opportunities created for Care Leavers by the Lead Member in securing free driving lessons and apprenticeships and budgeting skills and financial advice from Barclays Bank.
- 2.6 In line with the requirement for all Local Authority to have a Local Offer clarifying Care Leaver's entitlement, a draft Local Offer has been written and was presented to the

Corporate Parenting Group in August 2018. There is on-going consultation regarding the plan and following this the Local Offer will be finalised and published in November 2018.

- 2.7 There is clear evidence that Elected Members and corporate leaders are now taking actions to demonstrate their commitment to corporate parenting in a way that was not previously evident, and issues raised at the Corporate Parenting Group are translated into action, followed through and implemented.

3. PARTICIPATION OFFICER AND CHILDREN IN CARE COUNCIL

- 3.1 Our newly appointed Participation Officer has been in post since May 2018 and has made tremendous impact in revising and energising the Children in Care Council. Participation of Looked After Children has increased in several areas, providing valuable input to service improvements and ensuring that we listen to their voice and act on what they are telling us about what we need to change to improve. This include active involvement in the Children in Care Council meetings every two weeks; meetings with senior officers to share their views about services; presentations to social workers and other staffs about what the Children in Care Council is and how to encourage more young people to be involved; active involvement in interviews and appointments of permanent staff such as the Director of Children's Services, Assistant Director of Children's Services, Service Managers, Team Managers, Practice Manager, Social Workers, and Personal Assistants in the Leaving Care Service.
- 3.2 The Care Leavers football group was entered into this year's Regional Care Leavers football tournament and won the competition.

4 EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

- 4.1 There has been significant improvement in the performance of the Virtual School and 97% of the children have Personal Education Plans that ensures their particular needs are prioritised in school to help them reach their potential.
- 4.2 At the end of August 2018, 70% of our 16/17 year olds are in Education, Training or Employment (45.5% for Statistical Neighbours) and 53% of 18-21 year olds are in Education, Training or Employment.
- 4.3 As of September 2018 we have 12 Care Leavers attending Higher Education (11 Under Graduate and 1 Post Graduate). 4 Care Leavers are undertaking Apprenticeships and the council have ringed fenced further Apprenticeship for 8 Care Leavers.
- 4.4 The Leaving Care Service is proactively working in partnership with the Virtual School Team and Positive Steps to promote and engage those young people Not in Education, Employment and Training in a range of education, employment and training opportunities locally.

5. ELECTED MEMBERS LINK TO CHILDREN'S HOMES

- 5.1 Arrangements have been made and are now in place for elected members to be linked to children's homes. This provide members the opportunity to see and connect with young people in their living environment and understand the living experience of the young people and in some cases provides mentoring support as appropriate.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 As stated on the report cover

This page is intentionally left blank