

## Environment and Regeneration Select Committee

**Date: 21/03/06**

**Review Title: Street Lighting**

<b>Scrutiny Chair/Project Manager:</b>	<b>Contact details:</b>
Councillor Beaumont	
<b>Scrutiny Officer:</b>	<b>Contact details:</b>
Sarah Connolly	
<b>Lead Service Officer:</b>	
Mick Robinson/Tom Andrew	
1. Which of our strategic corporate objectives does this topic address?	
Safer Communities; Liveability; Resource Management	
2. What are the main issues?	
Energy Costs; Efficiency of services; Public Safety; Sustainability; Asset Management; Energy Sources; Columns	
3. The Thematic Select Committee's overall <b>aim</b> in doing this work is:	
To advise upon strategic and operational policy considering energy cost, service efficiency, sustainability and community safety	
4. The main <b>objectives</b> are:	
To complete the scrutiny review and make recommendations on future policy regarding the delivery of street lighting services	
5. The possible <b>outputs</b> (changes in service delivery) are:	
Change to street lighting policy leading to change in operational delivery e.g. different maintenance and operating regimes and procurement	
6. The desirable <b>outcomes</b> (benefits to the community) are:	
Improved service to the community in terms of quality, price and improved customer satisfaction	
7. What specific value can scrutiny add to this topic?	
Independent challenge and confidence in service delivery	
8. Who will the panel be trying to influence as part of their work?	
SBC and Websters (strategic partners)	
9. Duration of enquiry?	

4- -6 months

10. What category does the review fall into?

Policy Review

Policy Development

External Partnership

Performance Management

Holding Executive to Account

11. Extra Resources needed? Who is the nominated Democratic Services Officer? Who is the nominated Scrutiny Officer?

Sarah Connolly (Scrutiny), Fiona Shayler (DSO)

12. What secondary/existing information do we need? (include here background information, existing reports, updated reports, legislation, central government documents, etc.)

Best Value Review 2001; Websters partnership arrangements; Delegated decisions; Highways Act; Code of Practice; case history, Local Transport Plan

13. What primary/new evidence/information do we need?

Research into Private Finance Investment

14. In what form do you want this evidence/information to be presented? (short presentation, executive summary, e-mail brief)

Executive Summary; reports as appropriate

15. Who can provide us with further relevant evidence? (Cabinet Member/portfolio holder, officer, service user, general public, expert witness, etc.)

Other Local Authorities; Specialist Bodies

16. What specific areas do we want them to cover when they give evidence? (for exact questioning framework, see form ?)

Good Practice

17. Where will evidence be taken and how?

Meetings; Site Visits

18. Would the investigation benefit from the co-option of an 'expert' or service user, for the duration of the major review? If so, who?

Support of qualified electrical engineer independent of the service

19. What other processes can we use to feed into the review? (site visits/observations, face-to-face questioning, telephones survey, written questionnaire, etc.)

Site visits; face-to-face consultation; audit of management systems; focus groups

20. How long will the review last? Are there specific time limits that need to be taken into consideration?

4-6 months

21. In what ways can we involve the public and at what stages? ( consider whole range of consultative mechanisms, local committees and local ward mechanisms)

Initial customer satisfaction; Viewpoint and monitoring; focus groups

22. How will tasks be divided between Members/Officers? (Please give name of each member or officer or other stakeholder when detailing each task)

To be determined

23. How will we monitor progress and measure the success of the review?

Project Management – project plan monitoring at each meeting