

COUNTY SURVEYORS SOCIETY
Engineering Committee
Street Lighting Group

Minutes of the Meeting held on Thursday 15th June 2006
at the Royal Institution of Naval Architects
10 Upper Belgrave Street, London, SW1X 8BQ.

Present: -

Name	Authority
Alan Micklewaite	Road Services Northern Ireland
Bob Willmott	Jacobs Babtie (Kent County Council)
Derek Powell	Worcestershire County Council
Stuart Bulmer	URS (Buckinghamshire County Council)
Roger Elphick (Chair)	Durham County Council
David Coatham (Acting Secretary)	Institution of Lighting Engineers
Peter Hosking	Leicestershire County Council
Neil Johnson	Northumberland County Council
Mel Harwood	Dudley MBC
Lee Evans	Caerphilly CBC
Bryan Geeves	County and City of Cardiff
Ian Jones	Cheshire County Council
Dave Johnson	Transport for London
Trevor Rawson	London Borough of Hackney
Lindsay McGregor	Dundee City & Perth and Kinross Councils

		Action														
1.	<p>Apologies The Secretary reported apologies from:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Barry Greenaway</td> <td>Gloucestershire county Council</td> </tr> <tr> <td>John Beaton</td> <td>Highlands Council</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Colin Payne (Secretary)</td> <td>Leeds City Council</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mike Smith</td> <td>Highways Agency</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Glyn Williams</td> <td>Cornwall County Council</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Geoff Edwards</td> <td>Wrexham CBC</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Phil Scraggs</td> <td>Suffolk County Council</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Barry Greenaway	Gloucestershire county Council	John Beaton	Highlands Council	Colin Payne (Secretary)	Leeds City Council	Mike Smith	Highways Agency	Glyn Williams	Cornwall County Council	Geoff Edwards	Wrexham CBC	Phil Scraggs	Suffolk County Council	
Barry Greenaway	Gloucestershire county Council															
John Beaton	Highlands Council															
Colin Payne (Secretary)	Leeds City Council															
Mike Smith	Highways Agency															
Glyn Williams	Cornwall County Council															
Geoff Edwards	Wrexham CBC															
Phil Scraggs	Suffolk County Council															
1a	<p>Changes in Membership</p> <p>The Chairman welcomed Lindsay McGregor who has taken over representation of the Scottish Regions from James Milne who had retired since the last meeting of the Group. The Chairman also welcomed Trevor Rawson who has joined the Group to represent the London Boroughs.</p> <p>Both new members said how pleased they were to join the Group and Lindsay McGregor also reported that John Beaton was recovering well from his heart attack and hoped to join the Group again at one of its forthcoming meetings. The Chairman asked Lindsay to pass on the best wishes of the Group to John.</p>															

		Action
2.	Minutes of the Previous Meeting The Minutes of the meeting of the 22 nd March 2006 were approved.	
3.	Matters Arising from Previous Minutes	
3a	3G and Wireless Communications It was reported that the 3G system in Cardiff was up and running and had been so for a number of years. The City was also looking at a WiFi project with BT in the near future. It was also reported that Walsall has signed an agreement directly with BT and not through their PFI provider. Cheshire County Council also had a scheme up and running which they were pleased with, however, the high costs applicable to moving existing apparatus were a concern.	All
3b	Traffic Island Maintenance It was confirmed that the revised Chapter 8 document was due to be published and that a series of three seminars were planned to coincide with its release. There was still concern over the increasing provision of traffic islands in locations where they could not be safely maintained without a total road closure. It was confirmed that the revised Chapter 8 will not contain any specific guidance on the requirements for short term works for faults and lamp changes on such installations and that only standard works are covered. Colin Payne has spoken to the authors of the revised Chapter 8 and had been advised that the work should be risk managed and a method statement prepared in respect of differing locations so as to mitigate any risk. This should be on the basis of what is reasonably practicable. It is understood that the Health and Safety Executive are investigating a fatality that occurred in Essex to an operative undertaking electrical testing in such a situation and that their findings may have implications for this type of work and how it is carried out. It was agreed that local authorities should look more closely at how they will maintain this type of apparatus. It is understood that a number of contractors are talking about refusing to maintain such installations unless the road is totally closed. It was agreed that this issue should be raised at the next Roads Liaison Group meeting.	All Chairman and RLG
3c	BS 5489 Secretary's Note. Subsequent to the meeting the Secretary has been advised that the revisions to BS 5489-1:2003 were published on the 28 th April 2006. These amendments include:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of the symbol for Uo in section 3.2 • The deletion and replacement of text in section 10.7.3 with regard to outdoor car park lighting and the inclusion of a table of applicable lighting levels. • Amendments to the Notes to Table B2 reference traffic flows • The inclusion of a note to Table B4 reference the overall uniformity for S Class Lighting. 	All

		Action
4.	<p>Engineering Committee</p> <p>The Chairman presented a verbal report on the last Engineering Committee held on the 24th May 2006</p>	
4a	<p>2006/07 Business Plan</p> <p>The Chairman presented the latest Business Plan for the Engineering Committee and the Street Lighting Group (see previously circulated documents). Unfortunately none of the street lighting CSS research bids for this year had been allocated funding at present, although one of them is the top reserve bid.</p>	
4b	<p>Committee Structure and Society name</p> <p>The structure of the committees and the name of the society have both been looked at with a view to revising them however it was felt that they still served their purpose and no changes were proposed at the present time.</p>	
4c	<p>Thin Surface Materials</p> <p>Thin surface materials are now being referred to as “Negative Texture Materials” in the latest research report. There was some concern raised about the effect of these materials on lighting levels and uniformity levels (especially on resurfacing schemes where the whole reflectivity of the surface could be significantly changed). It was agreed that further research was required into this issue and that this problem should be brought to the attention of the materials engineers.</p>	
4d	<p>Backlogs</p> <p>The Committee is concentrating its efforts on issues associated with the general backlog of highway maintenance and the need for additional funding. The recent proposal by the Department for Transport to give an indicative allocation in LTPs for street lighting renewal was welcomed. It was accepted that maintenance backlog assessments and allocations should, in general, be based on asset management reviews once the data was available.</p>	
4e	<p>National Traffic Management Group</p> <p>A National Traffic Manager Group is being set up under the auspices of the Department for Transport and will draw upon the resources of the Regional Traffic Manager Groups.</p>	
4f	<p>Sector Schemes</p> <p>The County Surveyors’ Society is to recommend to all its members that they should endorse and require the use of the National Sector Schemes where applicable for work on local roads.</p>	

		Action
4g	<p>Closer links with other organisations</p> <p>The Society is looking to develop closer links with the IHT on similar lines to those it enjoys with ILE.</p>	
4h	<p>Road Workers Safety Group</p> <p>It was reported that the IHT were in the process of setting up a working group to review and advise on the safety of operatives working on the highway. The Highways Agency had also developed an Action Plan following concerns at the number of casualties on Trunk Roads recently.</p>	
4i	<p>Highways Agency Issues</p> <p>There was a need for closer co-operation by the HA on their research projects and the review of standards where these inevitably had implications for local roads. This is to be raised at the RLG.</p>	
5.	<p>Road Liaison Group (RLG)</p> <p>The Chairman confirmed that the 'Maintaining a Vital Asset' leaflet had now been published and could be downloaded from the RLG website (www.roadscodes.org) or purchased directly from the DfT. This should be widely circulated to Members and Officers to increase awareness of the purpose of the RLG and the Boards and highlight the importance of highway maintenance.</p>	All
5a	<p>Commuted Sums</p> <p>Lee Evans raised the issue of commuted sums for the ongoing maintenance of highways as his authority is being challenged by a number of developers as to the legality of this. A number of these cases involved Section 38 works where the roads had been completed up to 15 years prior and still not been adopted. The developer was now keen for the roads to be adopted but the Council required it to be brought up to current standards and for some of the apparatus such as street lighting to be replaced as it was past its half life. The Chairman reported that this was the top priority research project for the Engineering Committee and that work had commenced on this. The work that Stuart Bulmer had already done would need to be incorporated and he was asked to liaise with Robert Biggs.</p>	
6.	<p>Lighting Board Minutes</p> <p>The Minutes of the last meeting of the Group held 30th November 2005 were noted. The Chair did not raise any particular issues as many of the items were on the Agenda.</p> <p>The Chairman reported that he believed that the Lighting Board had reached a critical point in that it had now identified and completed the development of a number of initiatives. It was now essential that representatives of the Board and the Lighting Group drive these initiatives forward at their local regional groups and stress the importance of embedding the processes into each authority's management procedures. He asked all members to promote these initiatives as much as possible and confirmed that a letter is to be sent to local authorities by the Lighting Board in the near future outlining the current position.</p>	All

		Action
7.	<p>Energy Costs and Issues</p> <p>It was proposed that the Society should repeat the survey it had previously carried into the cost of energy for highway purposes in view of the recent and continuing escalation in costs. David Coatham advised that ASLEC were looking at doing a similar survey and that we should try to co-ordinate with them otherwise people may become cynical about these surveys.</p> <p>It was reported that a number of DNO's are becoming increasingly concerned about the accuracy of the inventories used for un-metered supplies and also the maintenance of the power factor of the supply and were looking to carry out detailed surveys of the systems to establish the accuracy. There was however a problem over who should pay for these inventory checks with the DNO's believing it to be the responsibility of the authorities to prove the accuracy. It is understood that they are asking OFGEM to review this situation.</p> <p>There is a growing concern over the use of system charges and the high levels of increase. Whilst this was only a small charge per lighting point cumulatively it was a large amount to an average local authority who did not appear to get any major service benefit from the DNO's in return. It was agreed that this issue should be raised with OFGEM as they were responsible for authorising these costs. (Please see attached extract).</p> <p>A number of representatives raised the issue that higher energy costs have to be absorbed rather than being separately funded and that this is resulting in a reduction or a curtailment of replacement lighting programmes and may affect normal maintenance if the anticipated increases materialise. It was agreed that it would be useful for the Group to develop and publish a document setting out the issues associated with maintaining lighting and for not switching it off or reducing its operational hours. It was agreed that a small group consisting of Peter Hoskins, Lee Evans, Stuart Bulmer, Dave Coatham and Bob Willmott would look at this and try to produce a draft document for the next meeting that could be issued as guidance for authorities on energy management. This could cover issues such as the use of lower lighting levels, dimming and different lamp types, including LEDs.</p> <p>Lee Evans advised that some Welsh Authorities were looking at the advantages/disadvantages of linking their highway energy accounts to their property energy accounts to see if this gave a better rate. However there are a number of internal problems to be overcome with such arrangements.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Secretary should invite Roger Morgan from OFGEM to the next meeting of the Group to discuss these issues.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>Secretary</p>

		Action
8.	<p>Local Transport Plan – Issues</p> <p>The Chairman reported that the UK Lighting Board intended to carry out a further survey of the national profile of the lighting stock and that a letter would be going out to all authorities as soon as possible from the Board setting out the requirements.</p> <p>It was agreed that there was an urgent need for training on asset management and whole life costing. The ILE were looking at running a series of short one day training courses on this issue and hoped to have them available by the Autumn. It was also reported that there had been some delays in the revision of TR 22 and that this was not expected to be completed before December. It was hoped that this document would still be available for the Surveyor/ILE Conference in December.</p> <p>Lindsay McGregor reported that the Scottish Assembly was looking at the production of a standard asset management system for all of the Scottish Authorities and was considering letting a contract for this work funded from its Effective Government Fund.</p> <p>The Lighting Board were also currently reviewing how the indicative funding through the LTP for street lighting renewal in England should be assessed and distributed.</p>	<p>L Board</p> <p>D Coatham</p>
9.	<p>Code of Practice – Well Lit Highways</p> <p>It was confirmed that the Road Liaison Group intended to review the three maintenance Codes of Practice every four years and that the Lighting Code would therefore be the first to be reviewed commencing late 2007. All members of the Group were asked to consider improvements, additions, deletion, etc they would like to see made to the document. A consultant is to be appointed to project manage the review process.</p> <p>David Coatham reported that he had already received a number of comments and was keeping a list of these to pass on to the person looking after the review.</p>	All
10.	<p>Street Lighting Maintenance Backlog</p> <p>David Coatham reported that the ILE, LIF and ASLEC were coordinating a review of the ‘Protecting a Vital Asset’ (PAVA) leaflet and that they hoped this would be produced in time for the ILE Conference in Manchester (October) and for the next APPLG meeting in November.</p>	D Coatham
11.	<p>Competition in Connections</p>	
11a	<p>Lee Evans reported that the Service Level Agreement trials that started 01/04/05 were extended to 01/04/06 and that OFGEM are now reviewing the information received. However, there is concern that the DNO’s have not made available and shared their information with the local authorities before submitting it to OFGEM and that this may give a biased view of the trials. OFGEM are proposing to give the local authorities a chance to view and review</p>	All

		Action
<p>11b</p> <p>11c</p>	<p>this data but some of the DNO's are not comfortable with this proposal. OFGEM propose to give the local authorities 5 options with regard to the information presented and proposed to have returns back by 30/06/06, but will have to extend this deadline due to errors in the data. OFGEM have also decided to extend the trials until they have completed their review. The information available so far does not appear to demonstrate a particularly poor overall performance by the DNO's and therefore OFGEM is not inclined to impose licensing amendments on the DNO's based on the information available at present. It was felt that the impact of the trial itself may well have improved DNO performances but it was still considered essential that a national SLA was available for reference purposes.</p> <p>OFGEM have initiated a review into Competition in Gas and Electricity Connections commencing with a request for comments from interested parties. It was reported that the CSS, UK Lighting Board and the ILE had all replied and made comments on the difficulties, time delays and the cost of electrical connections for highway electrical service works. A workshop on this issue was also held by OFGEM on the 24th May 2006, however, due to the limited advanced warning given only two local authority representatives attended out of a total of 120 delegates. This was considered to be unsatisfactory and all members were requested to try and attend and support any future workshops in the Autumn to review the responses to the consultation. The papers for this workshop are due to be published on the OFGEM website.</p> <p>Lee Evans reported that no Tripartite Agreements between a local authority, DNO and a service provider had been signed due to the difficulties of the agreement and the intransigence of the DNO's who had not prepared the necessary documentation. However, his authority (Caerphilly County Council) was setting up a trial which would operate from September 2006 to determine the viability of the process and to resolve any difficulties. It was hoped that a successful trial would led to an ongoing arrangement and to other authorities setting up similar agreements.</p>	
<p>12.</p>	<p>Light Pollution</p> <p>It was confirmed that the Clean Neighbourhoods Act had now been enacted and this included light pollution. Guidance on light pollution and the interpretation of the Act has also been published by DEFRA and could be accessed on their Website. Whilst street lighting as such does not come under this legislation the DEFRA guidance recommends that any complaints about light pollution should be treated sympathetically by the local authorities. It is anticipated that the number and frequencies of complaints related to street lighting issues will increase as the public become more aware of light pollution issue.</p>	
<p>13.</p> <p>13a</p>	<p>Research</p> <p>The Chairman confirmed that the risk management procedures had now been fully developed and that authorities should be embedding the process in their management systems. Full inventories should now have been completed and Members were asked to emphasise the importance of this and the link to condition indicator assessment at their Regional meetings. A revised edition of Technical Report TR22 is in preparation and a final version is expected to be available for the December 2006 Surveyor/ILE Conference. An article on Risk Management featured in the May/June edition of the Lighting Journal.</p>	

		Action
13b	The final report on the research into the 'Effect on Lighting on Road Surface Materials' had been published. This can be accessed on the Road Liaison Group web site.	
13c	The drafting of the Term Maintenance Model Contract Document was now proceeding again and the ICE had renewed its involvement in its production. It is planned to have the document available for the ILE Conference in October.	
13d	Reference was made to the UK RLG Priority Bids for funding from the DfT Research Budget and the Group were concerned that the decision of the Minister was still awaited. The two top priority lighting bids relate to 'Street Lighting and Night Time Casualties' and 'A Review of Street Lighting Classes'. It was noted that joint funding was likely with both these proposed projects and they both had an important link with energy management that was now becoming a high priority for the Lighting Board.	
13e	With regard to the CSS Research Fund proposals for 2006/07, initial allocations of funding had been made in February 2006 and the Engineering Committee proposal to 'Develop National Guidance on Commuted Sum Criteria and Payments' had been approved. This would include street lighting and the preliminary work already done by Stuart Bulmer. One of the three reserve projects included 'Road Lighting as an Accident Remedial Measure'. It was also noted that TRL had established that reducing lighting levels does not reduce reaction times and consequently reduced lighting levels may be acceptable. Dave Johnson confirmed that TfL were anxious to get the road casualty research under way as quickly as possible whilst their funding contribution was still available.	
14.	Performance Indicators	
14a	With regard to BV215, the Lighting Board had raised concerns that the results could be distorted depending upon whether or not scouting had been undertaken by each authority. Results that are due to be submitted in July and published in December will be monitored to identify any discrepancies. It may be necessary to recommend to the Audit Commission that the method used to record faults is also reported in future.	
14b	<p>The Lighting Board has agreed to the introduction of a condition indicator for lighting column assessment within an authority based upon 'the percentage of the lighting column stock within an authority with a 'Current Priority' greater than zero' (in other words where the Current Age is greater than the Action Age). A letter is being prepared by the Board covering the following important requirements for authorities in England and most of the principles are considered to be equally relevant elsewhere in the UK, although funding arrangements may vary. This will bring together many of the fundamental developments that have taken place over the past few years:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Appendix A' Inventory Requirements • 'Appendix B' Inventory Requirements • The implementation of Risk Management Procedures • The introduction of a column condition indicator • Indicative street lighting funding allocations through LTPs 	

15.	Lighting Column Technical Forum	Action
	<p>The Group considered an invitation that had been received by CSS offering the Society representation on the ILE Lighting Column Technical Forum. In view of the considerable links with industry that already exist through the ILE Technical Committee, the Lighting Board and other Groups, the Group appreciated the invitation, but did not consider it necessary to take up this offer at the present time. Meeting the increasing demands for CSS representation on a wide range of Committees was becoming more difficult with the limited resources available in the Society.</p>	
16.	WEEE Directive	
	<p>No issues were raised by Members with regard to the implementation of the Directive. This was particularly the case now that it had been confirmed that batched disposal of lamps was now acceptable.</p>	
17.	Sector Schemes	
	<p>It was confirmed that the Society are to recommend the adoption of Sector Schemes by local authorities, although it was noted that there was a need to ensure that there was compatibility with any local QA scheme that may be in place.</p> <p>Courses were being developed, including NVQs, although there was a shortage of public lighting resources. A magazine was being launched by ASLEC to increase awareness of the schemes. There was also a need to survey how many organisations had taken up the scheme.</p>	
18.	Regional Meetings and Representation	
	<p>No Minutes of regional meetings had been distributed and no items of significant business were raised. Bob Willmott pointed out that the revised regional representation map still showed his area as including London. This was not the case now that the London Boroughs and TfL had separate representation by Trevor Rawson and Dave Johnson respectively.</p>	
19.	Any Other Business	
19a	<p>UMSUG</p> <p>There was a brief discussion regarding the requirement for all installations of over 500 watts to have a metered supply. There was also a need to clarify with Colin Payne who was representing CSS on UMSUG.</p>	
19b	<p>Passive Safety</p> <p>It was noted that a conference on Passive Safety (not just for street lighting) was to be held on 22 June 2006 at the Institution of Civil Engineers.</p>	
20.	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>17th October 2006, at the Royal Institution of Naval Architecture, 10 Upper Belgrave Street, London, SW1X 8BQ.</p>	

Extract (see Item 7.)

Unmetered Distribution Use of System Charges.

Mr. Chevalier has copied me in on his correspondence to you with regard to this issue and his suggestion that the UK Lighting Board should fund research (estimated at £5,000). I believe this proposal looks expensive for what we would obtain and that with a little bit of research we could obtain the costs from our members and do a simple calculation on a spreadsheet to obtain these comparisons. However, his comments have raised other issues and I believe we should look at it from a slightly different viewpoint. The use of system cost can represent between 10% and 23% of the total unit cost of energy (based on 8pence per kWh) dependent upon the area, which would appear to be rather excessive. However, if you look at the total annual cost for a large local authority with about 86,000 lights this will cost them between £250,000 (£2.9 per annum per lighting point) and £588,000 (£6.84 per annum per lighting point) per annum again dependent upon location.

This money is paid direct to the DNO for use of its distribution system; however, as we have already paid for the capital cost of the new connections and would have to pay for their disconnection of it the cost can only be for maintenance and debt payments on the system. Over the life of a lighting unit (40 years) this could cost between £116 and £274. As any damage to the DNO's supply by vandalism or due to a car running in to the column generally has to be paid by the local authority and recovered if they can, the only cost to the electricity company would be if a supply failed, which is a rare occasion.

I think it would be beneficial to raise this with OFGEM as they are supposed to regulate these costs. It could at least give them some ammunition to use against the DNO's and to ensure that we get better treatment with regard to accident damage and faults on the network. I realise the DNO's will say that the unit cost we pay is very small, however, if you look at the total costs these are not insignificant sums of money most of which I would suggest go straight in to the shareholders' pockets.

As OFGEM have approved these latest increases on average 7% (well above the rate of inflation) it would be interesting to understand why they have been approved and what benefit the local authority's will receive for this additional cost.

This may be something we can raise with OFGEM as part of the consultation they are currently carrying out