

## **GWPC Monthly Meeting – 12<sup>th</sup> December 2023**

### **Briefing Paper for Agenda item: 23/1717**

**In relation to the Ford End average speed camera scheme, to receive an update of developments, to discuss options, and to agree next steps.**

1. This paper assumes an awareness of all previously reported matters in relation to the Ford End average speed camera (ASC) project. It reports on four areas:

- The consultation of parishioners;
- Project costs;
- ECC matched funding;
- DLUHC (Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities) approval.

### 2. Consultation

2.1. The consultation ended on 30/11/2023. There were 241 responses. The results were:

#### Question 1

Are you in FAVOUR of the Parish Council going ahead with the Average Speed Camera Scheme?

YES – 183 (75.9%); NO – 58 (24.1%)

#### Question 2

Are you in FAVOUR of the Parish Council going ahead with the Average Speed Camera Scheme if it includes a Council Tax parish precept increase equivalent to 25p per week/£13 annually (for a Band D property type) for five years for the purpose of repaying the loan?

YES – 159 (66.0%); NO – 82 (34.0%)

2.2. These results imply (assuming all who responded 'No' to Q.1 did the same for Q.2) that 24 individuals want an ASC scheme, but do not wish to further contribute to it through their Council Tax.

2.3. GWPC now has the opportunity to decide the type of mandate the results provide for continuing its work to seek the implementation of the scheme.

### 3. Project costs

3.1. The consultation was conducted to secure a mandate for raising a loan based upon the project costs being similar to those quoted previously, although recognising it likely that reasonable inflationary increases would need to be applied.

3.2. The Appendix shows the original 2021 project costs compared to those now being mooted.

3.3. It is understood from Jenoptik UK (the scheme's designated product and solutions provider) that the camera units and installation costs are likely to be c.4.5% higher. However, the original ECC Highways costs for the other elements of the project have now been projected to increase from £22k to £70k.

- 3.4. In addition, Highways have introduced 'Survey Costs' of £60,000 which were not specifically included in 2021. It is understood these additional costs have been cited as necessary because it is believed there was no provision originally for design of the foundations (of the camera posts) and the associated civil works required, or for geotechnical, GPR (ground penetrating radar) and topographical surveys.
- 3.5. GWPC has sought initial independent subject-matter expert advice which indicates the revised costs do not align with those one would currently expect for this type of scheme. The guidance obtained suggests there are no particular design issues and service surveys are common for this type of project and would typically be part of a standard works programme.
- 3.6. Therefore, driven principally by Highways' latest estimates, the cost of the scheme would increase by 98.0%.
- 3.7. A meeting between GWPC and Highways' design manager to understand and challenge the revised costs has not been possible. Therefore, currently an overall, mutually agreed, revised costing of the scheme (and therefore an appreciation of the amount necessary to finance 50 per cent under any matched funding arrangement) has yet to be established.

#### 4. ECC Matched Funding

- 4.1. To date the scheme has been predicated on equal (matched funding) between GWPC and ECC. The current arrangement is that ECC's Highways, Infrastructure and Sustainable Transport cabinet member will consider match funding the scheme when GWPC shows it has raised its half.
- 4.2. In the consultation, GWPC used the best information available (the 2021 estimated total scheme cost which used the ECC/manufacture figures) to position its question in relation to using the precept to raise a loan, but was aware that some revision of scheme costs was likely after a two-year gap.
- 4.3. The cabinet member's decision to match funding would also be subject to his willingness to override policy guidance which it is understood states the Ford End location does not meet the current ECC Highways criteria for the installation of average speed cameras. In 2019 the then cabinet member overruled policy and accepted that such a scheme could be implemented. However, the steps needed to commence the project at that time could not be completed (including, not least, GWPC's inability then to raise its 50 per cent). It is further understood that when such a decision is made it creates personal risk for the cabinet member, and is solely for him to determine.
- 4.4. Should GWPC conclude that the result of the consultation provides a mandate to ask the cabinet member to make a decision, it would need to consider its request in the context of it currently being able to cover half (or not much more than half, as things stand) of the 2021 estimate for the scheme.
- 4.5. GWPC may conclude that if the revised scheme costs are confirmed as having doubled, it could not raise the difference needed by principally using the precept without a further consultation. However, to be able to reach this conclusion it may wish to consider whether a ratification process on the revised costs involving all parties should be completed.
- 4.6. If the stage is reached where cabinet member is asked but is not inclined to match fund the scheme, that in itself would not necessarily mean the new costs of the scheme are

not still required. GWPC may still be left with a full funding option through the Essex Highways Solutions route (that is, the scheme and its costs would still require validation, but GWPC would need to engage in the EHS process where potential projects are considered for progression but without any ECC financial support).

## 5. DLUHC approval

5.1. GWPC must obtain DLUHC approval to take out a loan. A reason for holding the consultation was to satisfy one of the application criteria. Also, the application will need detailed costings of the whole scheme.

5.2. In the absence of any previous experience of making applications to DLUHC, the speed of the process and the approval success rate are unknown.

## 6. Next Steps

Based on the above (and any other information which emerges either after this paper is circulated or at the meeting itself), so that its position and instructions are clear for the future, it is recommended GWPC now considers and makes necessary decisions in relation to:

6.1. The results of the consultation. Do they provide a mandate for it to continue to seek a loan to match fund the costs of implementing an ASC scheme on the B1008 at Ford End?

6.2. Securing detailed information on the proposed revised scheme costs.

6.3. Seeking further independent subject-matter expertise to assist the validation and potential challenge of the proposed revised scheme costs.

6.4. Seeking, as required, relevant meetings directly with other interested parties, e.g. the ECC cabinet member, assigned scheme design manager, product manufacturers, independent subject-matter experts etc.

6.5. Seeking the ECC cabinet member's decision on whether ECC will agree to match funding.

6.6. Its position should ECC match funding support not be made available.

6.7. Its communication strategy to parishioners and other parties based on the above considerations.

## Appendix

### Ford End ASC Cost Comparison (2023 cf. 2021)

	2021		2023 Est.	Notes
<b>Jenoptiks</b>				
Equipment	£ 53,553		£ 53,553	No change (per Jenoptiks) 2023= 2021 + 15%
Installation	£ 15,080		£ 17,342	
Project Management	£ 4,050		£ 4,658	
Data SIMs (Year 1)	£ 680		£ 782	
Traffic Management (4 days, 2-way lights)	£ 3,120		£ 3,588	2023= 2021 + 15%
<b>Jenoptiks Total</b>	<b>£ 76,483</b>		<b>£ 79,923</b>	
Camera units	£ 76,483		£ 79,923	= Jenoptiks Total
Power supply	£ 9,500		£ 10,450	2023 = 2021 + 10%
Signs/Materials/Labour	£ 10,000			Includes ECC inflationary increase for 2023
Traffic management	£ 5,000			
Design	£ 3,000	£22,000	£ 70,000	
Supervision	£ 3,000			
Road safety Audit	£ 1,000			
Survey Costs	n/a		£ 60,000	New expense for 2023
Pro rata	£ 6,960	9.1%	£ 7,273	% = proportion of camera units costs
<b>Sub Total (1)</b>	<b>£ 114,943</b>		<b>£227,645</b>	
Overheads	£ 3,103	2.7%	£6,146	% = proportion of Sub-Total (1)
Profit	£ 2,874	2.5%	£5,692	% = proportion of Sub-Total (1)
<b>Sub Total (2)</b>	<b>£ 120,920</b>		<b>£239,483</b>	
Risk (0%)	£ -		£ -	
<b>Budget Total</b>	<b>£ 120,920</b>		<b>£239,483</b>	
Match Funding 50%	£ 60,460		£ 119,741	