

Street Lighting Working Group

(Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee)



20th February 2018

Location – Witham Room 12:05pm

Working Group Members present: Councillors Exton (ME), Russell (BR), Baxter (AR),
Coutts (LC), Brian Sumner (BS) and Wilkins (MW)
Cabinet Member for Environment: Councillor Dr Peter Moseley (PM)

Officers: Paul Stokes (Service Manager Venues and Town Centre Management) (PS)
Mike Smith (Team Leader Operations) (MS)
Carolyn Baker (Premises and Facilities Co-ordinator) (CB)
Kevin Munford (Projects Officer) (KM)
Democratic Officer (Lucy Bonshor) (LB)

Notes:

Before discussion started PM stated that it was unlikely that the Cabinet would support any option which did not keep the lights on.

A short discussion followed on whether options that included switching lights off should be included. It was felt that all options should be considered as part of the process, reasons for rejections should also be included.

Option A concerned fitting part night photocells to existing lighting stock. An example of a photocell was circulated and how they worked together with the costs – daylight sensors dawn/dusk with a timer attached – Members were not in favour of this option.

Option B concerned installing LED lighting with the addition of part night photocells – questions were asked about the costs including maintenance and whether this included fitting and the suitability of the columns as to whether LED lighting could be fitted as this would impact costs. As the LED lighting would be bought in bulk this would affect the contract and was something that could be negotiated. Relamp £300 – like for like £85.

MS said that the life span of an LED was between 15 – 20 years.

Option C concerned installing time switches to existing street lights – Light switches would be solar powered and reduced the number of hours the street light could be on. An example of a light switch was shown to Members.

MW asked about the difference between a photocell and time switch
KM stated time switches worked regardless of the light – photocells were more reliant on light which changed during the course of a year and timing had to be reset.

Questions were asked about the payback periods quoted and it was noted that there was a discrepancy with the figures with regard to options A and C.

MW referred to the sheet that had been circulated and compiled by AB which gave comparisons between options. Reference was made to Option X and the payback period for the Salix loan it was felt that this should be 13 rather than the 8 years quoted.

A brief outline of how a Salix loan worked was given by KM

Salix loans were funded by the Government but a caution was made about the payback timescale. Applying for a loan did not mean that the Council was guaranteed to get one. It was felt that any application for a loan should be split in to three separate loans. A proposed £1m budget allocation was a big ask compared to the current street lighting budget.

Members felt that more information on the possible savings and Salix loans was needed. MS referred to Rutland District Council who had gone down the Salix route and he would try and get information from them about any issues they had encountered.

PM referred to the location of some street lights and whether or not they were needed, he mentioned three lights that he was aware of that in his view were not required, they did not light a footpath, were located outside the curtilage of the village where he lived and where not located near any houses. He felt that a survey should be done relating to street light location to see if all street lights were necessary.

For clarity PS stated that the District Council looked after 3,593 lights including locations such as leisure centres, Wyndham Park, cycleways and car parks. In some instances such as Wharf Road car park in Stamford, housing developments had been built very near to the car park and therefore lighting from the housing development affected the lighting already located in the car park, from a safety aspect though he felt these lights should remain.

The current budget for street lighting was £230,000 split between electricity £120,000 and £110,000 for lamping and repairs. A forecast minimum saving of

£30,000 would still leave a budget of £190,000 and PS was concerned that this budget was not de-minimalized.

Examples were given of issues relating to lack of street lights at locations such as parks and the possibility of being sued due to lack of street lights.

It was stressed that all relevant issues relating to street lighting needed to be taken into consideration.

A question was asked about unadopted roads and who was responsible for the lights if not Lincolnshire County Council. It was stated that if the area was a private driveway it may be handed to the occupiers of the development within their deeds. However, this was dealt with by Lincolnshire County Council. The responsibility for the development prior to official adoption fell under the remit of the developer.

The following was suggested as a way forward:

- i. An exercise to identify potential locations where street lights were not required.
- ii. Simultaneously make enquires with Rutland District Council about Salix and how the Council may proceed.

It was proposed and agreed that the above suggestions be moved forward and that a further Working Group be held before the next meeting of the Committee with fully costed options including an option for turning street lights off. It was felt that options should aspire to be value for money.

The date of Tuesday 27th March was agreed as a date for the next Working Group. Papers for the working group, showing fully costed out options needed to be available to be circulated to Members by Tuesday 20th March. It was hoped that at the next Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee in April a recommendation could be made to the Cabinet on a way forward regarding street lighting.

Working Group closed at 1:22pm.