

Appendix 7

Reference	30P08
Executive Director	Donna Ball
Cabinet Member	

Section A

Service Area	Operations
Budget Option Description	Street Lighting Dimming

Budget Reduction Proposal – Detail and Objectives
<p>(What are we trying to achieve)</p> <p>To reduce energy costs for streetlighting by expanding on the current dimming programme for all lanterns containing the Philips Citytouch system - soon to be transferred to their new Interact City system, and as carried out by many other authorities across the UK.</p> <p>This is an expansion of the already embedded dimming scheme. The current dimming scheme has been in place for over 12 months, and we are actively dimming approx 500 roads across our highway network</p> <p>Driver For Change: (Why are we doing this)</p> <p>To reduce energy costs, further reduce carbon emissions, and to close the funding gap.</p> <p>What is the solution? (Intervention/methodology which addresses the issue/impact)</p> <p>To implement a dimming solution, over and above the current one which is a 50% dim from 00:00 to 06:00 hrs, that will still provide a good lighting service to the Borough which will further reduce energy costs over and above replacing older lamp sources with LED, but will not have a detrimental impact e.g. not dimming during peak times, etc.</p> <p>This process will not be delivered on a blanket approach. Each road will be assessed by officers to ensure suitability.</p> <p>Locations where exemptions will be applied include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lights at major junctions/ roundabouts. • In town centres where there is CCTV, high security businesses such as banks, and/or lots of people at night, for example near night clubs and train stations.

- Areas where street lights are needed to reduce road accidents or where the Authority considers it has a specific duty of care.
- Areas where there could be an increase in crime through reduced lighting, like pubs, clubs and specific night-time use in residential areas.
- Areas where for operational reasons the police require the highest levels of lighting including crime hotspots and increased lighting immediately following an incident.

What is the impact of the solution? (How will this benefit?)

A reduction in energy consumption and, therefore, costs, and also a further reduction in carbon emissions.

Summary of Cost Savings.

Summary of Cost Savings	24/25 £000	25/26 £000	26/27 £000	27/28 £000
Energy Costs			209	209
TOTAL			209	209

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on. Set out any impacts (positive and negative) on performance and costs

Property
No Impact
Service Delivery
No Impact
Organisation (Including Other Directorates/Services)
No Impact
Workforce – Number of posts likely to be affected.
No Impact

Communities and Service Users
This is an extension of an already embedded programme of dimming. To date there has been no negative feedback from communities or service users.
Other Partner Organisations
No Impact

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations

Risks	Mitigations
Turning lights off may not be a popular action.	Equality Impact Assessment needs to be carried out along with consultation with members of Team Bury.
There are already two Capital programmes in progress in street lighting.	Additional staff/consultancy time for project management.
Time taken to complete the work and therefore delivery of the associated savings.	Existing GMCA Frameworks will be used for the work. Letting further contracts from The Chest to assist with the project. Taking on temporary staff (internal) to assist with the project.
Future energy prices decrease reducing estimated savings and increasing the time in which savings will be paid back.	Without this investment the Council would have to find additional funding to cover energy costs increases. This proposal will mitigate against the increases.
There is an annual cost for the Philips City Touch system after the initial 10 year (given at time of lantern purchase) has expired. This is estimated at around £5 per lantern. The GMCA Street Lighting Group are looking at a contract for this to reduce these costs.	It may transpire that paying an annual fee for each lantern, takes up a significant amount of any savings achieved. The current settings of the lantern (including any dimming) will be maintained if the CityTouch subscription expires. However, remote alteration of lantern settings will no longer be available.
Delivery delays due to material shortages, etc., may extend estimated completion time. Price increases may result in less work being carried out and thereby reducing savings.	Purchasing all the required materials at the start of the project would alleviate this and also negate any future price increases.

Energy calculations are quite complex and actual savings might be lower than estimated.	A combination of previous examples, experience, and airing on the side of caution have been used to try and ensure that as accurate an estimate as possible has been achieved. Savings will still be achieved, and it is possible they may be even more than estimated.
Increase in crime and anti-social behaviour and negative impact on the Safer Streets Strategy from Central Government.	None.
Variations in weather will affect the amount of energy savings, for example, sunny, bright days use less energy than dull, cloudy days. (The streetlights are programmed to switch on at a specific lux level (lighting level) which varies depending on weather conditions.)	None.

Key Delivery Milestones

Include timescales for procurement, commissioning changes etc.

Milestone	Timeline
The completion of Phase Column and Lantern replacement	March 2025
The completion of Phase 3 Lantern replacement	March 2026

Section D

Consultation Required?	No
------------------------	----

N/A	Start Date	End Date
Staff		
Trade Unions		
Public		

Service User		
Other		

Section E

Financial Implications and Investment Requirements

Investment requirements – Revenue and Capital
Capital Funding has already been awarded for the replacement lanterns which will support the dimming process.
Finance Comments – Will the proposal deliver the savings and within the agreed timescales?
Yes

Reference	3OP10
Executive Director	Donna Ball
Cabinet Member	

Section A

Service Area	Operations
Budget Option Description	District Car Parking

Budget Reduction Proposal – Detail and Objectives
<p>(What are we trying to achieve)</p> <p>To undertake a review and to consider implementation of district car parking charges.</p> <p>(Why are we doing this)</p> <p>To determine if district car parking charges can be implemented without adversely impacting the vibrancy of our district centres. To protect residential areas we will need to consider a resident parking zone(RPZ) in the immediate vicinity of the car parks. This will be necessary to ensure motorists do not park in the residential streets, rather than pay the proposed rates suggested below. This element of the scheme is essential to ensure local residents are not impacted by this proposal</p> <p>What is the solution?</p> <p>A strategic review of all Parking Services controlled district car parks will be commissioned to assess the viability and likely consequences of implementing a regime of car parking charges.</p> <p>(How will this benefit?)</p> <p>Increase in parking revenue.</p> <p>Any surplus in revenue generated by on street and/or off street car parking charges must be used in accordance with Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</p>

Summary of Cost Savings/Income Generation.

Financial Information

It should be noted that any predicted increase in revenue must be used in accordance with Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. This restricts the use of the income to the management and maintenance of car parking services and other highway/transportation related

works. It would therefore be permissible to use any additional income to enhance the standard of our car parks, which often create a first impression of our district centres.

Additional income will not be fully achieved until implementation of RPZs are complete. Residents will incur an ongoing annual charge £35 per RPZ permit.

Multiple charging tariffs and occupancy levels have been considered, however officers believe that a flat charging regime of £2 with 50% occupancy is likely to be supported by the strategic car parking review.

The Fairfax Road and Longfield Centre car parks account for approximately 40% of our district car parking spaces. These car parks are due to be redeveloped as part of the imminent Prestwich Regeneration Scheme. The income generated by the redeveloped car park is included below based on the indicative charging regime described earlier, but the management costs for this car park are unknown and are not included in this document. The potential income generated by this proposal is set out below, with deductions for the operational costs detailed lower in the report.

Summary of Cost Savings/Income Generation	24/25 £000	25/26 £000	26/27 £000
Part year additional savings		55	
Full year additional savings			126
TOTAL			

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on. Set out any impacts (positive and negative) on performance and costs

Property
The current district car parks will move to being chargeable. To support this, there would need to be infrastructure work required to install the pay and display machines.
Service Delivery
Organisation (Including Other Directorates/Services)
Not Applicable
Workforce – Number of posts likely to be affected.
There will be an increase in staff to manage the additional work that this scheme will generate
Communities and Service Users

This scheme represents an introduction of a charging structure for something our communities and service users have not previously paid for. Therefore, an extensive and wide ranging consultation plan will sit behind this scheme.

Other Partner Organisations

Section C

Key Risks and Mitigations

Risks	Mitigations
New/increased charges may drive parkers away from the car parks to seek free parking elsewhere i.e. on-street in adjacent residential areas.	Introduction of parking restrictions/residents parking schemes and other TROs
Financial assumptions - a tariff has not been set and how car park occupancy will vary based on which tariff is selected is not known.	Consultants to be appointed to carry out review of parking assets and to develop a strategy for charging with likely impacts modelled.
Future disposal of the Council's car parking assets.	Car park income to be a consideration in regeneration/improvement plans.
Political/reputational risk	Public and businesses likely to be against implementation of district charging and increased in tariffs.

Key Delivery Milestones

Include timescales for procurement, commissioning changes etc.

Milestone	Timeline
Completion of strategic car parking review.	Dec 2024
Implement Statutory Orders (Parking Places Order)	Mar 2025
Procurement/Delivery/Installation – P&D Machines and Signage	Oct 2025
Establish RPZs and install other Traffic Regulation Orders	Oct 2026

Section D

Consultation Required?	Yes – Extensive (Not Staff)
------------------------	-----------------------------

N/A	Start Date	End Date
Staff		
Trade Unions		
Public		
Service User		
Other		

Section E

Financial Implications and Investment Requirements

Investment requirements – Revenue and Capital
<p>Capital Required: Implementation of district charging will require P&D machines and new signage, approx. £170k required in 2025/26. RPZ design and implementation costs of approx. £50k required in 2026/27.</p> <p>Revenue Required: Additional enforcement contract costs of approx. £40k/annum and additional PCN processing and administration costs of approx. £25k/annum and a £15k revenue/maintenance cost for the charging apparatus</p>
Finance Comments – Will the proposal deliver the savings and within the agreed timescales?
Yes

Reference	Pend P4 Ops
Executive Director	Donna Ball
Cabinet Member	Cllr Quinn

Section A

Service Area	Operations
Budget Option Description	Resident Parking Permits

Budget Reduction Proposal – Detail and Objectives

Background

Resident Parking Schemes operate in streets close to town centres, around hospitals and near to Metrolink stations. They allow people who live in these streets to park close to their homes by restricting parking to permit holders only. Residents can apply for permits for their own vehicles and for visitors.

Permits are also available for businesses located within Resident Parking Scheme zones. There is an annual charge for this service of £35 for a resident parking permit and the council issues approx. 1500 permits a year generating an income of £65k.

In addition to this, residents can apply for up to two visitor permits. Bury does not charge for the first visitor permit, the second visitor permit is charged at £35.

We issue 5000 1st and 2300 2nd visitor permits. After reviewing how other Councils charge, we are looking to review how we manage and issue the visitor permits.

(Why are we doing this)

This will generate additional income which will help support our financial pressures, it will also bring us into line with other councils when it comes to visitor permits

(What is the solution?)

1. We propose to uplift the permit cost for residents from £35 to £45 per annum. This would generate an additional £15,000 of annual income. The proposed uplift would still put below 2 other GM districts.
2. We plan to introduce a new charge for 1st visitor permits of £25 per annum. This would generate an additional £125,000 of annual income. The proposed charge would be in line with other councils
3. We propose to uplift the cost for 2nd visitor permits from £35 to £45 per annum. This would generate an additional £23,000 of annual income.
4. We recognise that some of the visitor permits will be aligned to health and social support for our residents. Where this can be proven, the permits will remain free.
5. We will assume that 15% of the visitor permits are issued in line with point 4 and reduce the potential income target by £18,250

(How will we do this?)

The proposal will be subject to consultation with the outcome to be reported to Cabinet before a final decision is made with regard to implementing the proposal. Should the proposals be agreed it would be supported by targeted additional enforcement activity to ensure compliance.

Summary of Cost Savings.

Summary of Cost Savings	24/25 £000	25/26 £000	26/27 £000	27/28 £000
Increased Income		145k		
TOTAL		145k		

Section B

What impact does the proposal have on. Set out any impacts (positive and negative) on performance and costs

Property
No Impact
Service Delivery
No Impact
Organisation (Including Other Directorates/Services)
No Impact
Workforce – Number of posts likely to be affected.
No Impact
Communities and Service Users
Would see an uplift to residents who currently purchase a resident parking permit and the creation of a new charge for those who request visitor permits
Other Partner Organisations
No Impact

Section C**Key Risks and Mitigations**

Risks	Mitigations
Negative comms by increasing the cost for what is a captive audience	(Consultation and engagement)

Key Delivery Milestones

Include timescales for procurement, commissioning changes etc.

Milestone	Timeline

Section D

Consultation Required?	Yes
------------------------	-----

N/A	Start Date	End Date
Public		
Service User		
Other		

Section E**Financial Implications and Investment Requirements**

Investment requirements – Revenue and Capital
None
Finance Comments – Will the proposal deliver the savings and within the agreed timescales?
Yes