

Nottingham City Council Delegated Decision



Nottingham
City Council

Reference Number:

4506

Author:

Cathy Scales

Department:

Resident Services

Contact:

Cathy Scales

(Job Title: Parking Regulation and Compliance Service Manager, Email: cathy.scales@nottinghamcity.gov.uk, Phone: 8765339)

Subject:

Purchase of CCTV Vehicle for School Safety Enforcement and Revenue

Total Value:

£81,150.00 - This includes 5 years silver level maintenance costs. (Type: Capital and Revenue)

Decision Being Taken:

1) To agree funding to purchase a Generation 4 (EV) vehicle including four cameras and a pneumatic mast, to be used predominantly for school safety enforcement, but which can also be used for the enforcement of red routes, bus lanes and bus stops. (update: 11/01/2022 - Purchase agreed at Capital Board on 05/01/22. To be purchased in from income generated from Penalty Charge Notices (Budget already put aside).

Reasons for the Decision(s)

There are over 100 schools within the city conurbation that require school enforcement and almost all schools would like some type of enforcement on daily basis. School pick up and drop off times cause significant problems up and down the country. Parking Enforcement would like to purchase a Generation 4 (EV) "Spotter/Attended and Unattended CCTV Renault Zoe or Peugeot 208 vehicle (dependant on availability) which includes four cameras and a pneumatic mast. The vehicle will be used predominantly for school safety enforcement but can also be utilised for the enforcement of red routes, bus lanes and bus stops. Once the Traffic Management Act (part 6) is activated by the government (Summer 2022) the new CCTV vehicle could also be used to capture moving traffic violations. Part 6 has made provisions for Local Authorities in England and Wales to be granted powers to enforce and issue PCN's for various moving traffic offences which are currently enforced by the Police.

If both vehicles were used for school enforcement in addition to foot patrols this would see a further increase in income and provide more effective safety initiatives outside of other schools.

In terms of performance, a comparison is shown below of Penalty Charge Notices (PCN's) issued by foot patrol officers and the current CCTV vehicle.

September 2019 - to year date 208 PCN's have been issued by foot patrol officers and 556 PCN's have been issued by CCTV vehicle patrols.

The number of 556 vehicle PCNs has been achieved from only 110 days of vehicle use compared to 425 days of foot patrols since September 2019. The rate of vehicle patrols is low is due to maintenance and breakdown issues and only utilising the vehicle four days a week as Leicester City Council used the vehicle once a week too, however their use has ceased since the vehicle had a breakdown. It is evident that there is a clear increase in PCNs generated from the CCTV vehicle versus foot patrol enforcement.

CCTV vehicle use breakdown:

We first started using the CCTV vehicle on the 9th of September 2019. During this time, we have shared the vehicle with Traffic and Safety as they were carrying out enforcement of behalf of LCC.

We used the car for 6 months from the 9th of September 2019 up until the 13th of March 2019 (pre- Covid).

In September 2020 we started using the car again once children began to go back to school. However, this was only for one month before the vehicle had a breakdown and was off the road for a number of months.

We started to use the vehicle again in April 2021 and have continued to do so for the last seven months five days a week.

Income: - From September 2019 to date

Foot patrol - 208 PCNs issued raising £7,435 in paid income and £2,805 in outstanding income still to be paid. Total income = £10,258

CCTV Vehicle patrols - 556 PCN's issued raising £19,637 in paid income and £3,174 in outstanding income still to be paid. Total income = £22,811

In the last seven months there have been a total of 93 actual school days (excluding weekends). During this period 134 PCNs have been issued raising £4,050 in paid income and £1,500 in outstanding income. Based on the total income multiplied by 189 school days per year the CCTV vehicle is generating approximately £11,279 per annum

This income will be achieved from the new vehicle and does not include income from the old vehicle which we still plan to use and officer foot patrols giving us more coverage over the city and achieving additional income for the Council.

Three quotes were received from prominent suppliers in this field as set out below. TES - £81,150.00 for the vehicle, camera's. and Silver maintenance cost for 5 years. TES are already on the Council framework and the current CCTV vehicle and WPL vehicle were also purchased from them. SEA - £68,912.00 for the vehicle and cameras. Standard maintenance £3,700 per annum and £600 per annum for 3G data service. SEA cannot provide a mast-mounted camera which is one of our top requirements. Videalert - £66,150 for the vehicle and cameras. Silver maintenance £5.950 in year two and £4,000 per annum thereafter. Initially, this was the best quote but when we approached them about interfacing with our current review client the quote was withdrawn as this is not something they could do in terms of commercial sensitivity. SEA and Videalert were unable to meet our requirements. TES were able to demonstrate significantly better value for money for warranty and maintenance support and they offer a pneumatic mast therefore, this is the option we propose is the most suitable (£81,150.00).The costs will be met from revenue.

Other Options Considered:

The most appropriate option would have been to complete a full quotation process but this option was rejected on the basis that an informal process has already been carried out. Based on the future growth requirements and the estimated costing it is recommended that we proceed with purchasing an additional CCTV vehicle. The informal quote from TES was significantly better in vehicle, warranty and maintenance costs and they can meet all NCC's requirements.

** Not purchasing a vehicle could have an impact on school enforcement and income generation. There is a marked difference when using a camera vehicle compared to on foot officers.**

We have received numerous positive comments from parents and schools when the current vehicle has been in situ acting as a visible deterrent. Most other local authorities including Nottinghamshire County Council and Derby City Council are now utilising multiple CCTV vehicles for school enforcement.

Background Papers:

None

Published Works:

None

Affected Wards:

Citywide

Colleague / Councillor Interests:

None

Consultations:

Those not consulted are not directly affected by the decision.

Crime and Disorder Implications:

None. However, the livered vehicle will possibly act as a crime deterrent due to the cameras located on board.

Equality:

EIA not required. Reasons: EIA not required. Reason: This is not a new service or function.

Social Value Considerations:

N/A

Any implications affecting IT:	Yes
Decision Type:	Portfolio Holder
Subject to Call In:	Yes
Call In Expiry date:	31/01/2022
Advice Sought:	Legal, Finance, Procurement, IT
Legal Advice:	Given the total estimated value of the contract, at least three written quotations must be obtained in accordance with Article 18.55 of the Council's Contract Procedure Rules. The client department has complied with this provision. A formal contract will need to be entered into for the provision of the goods and associated services. Advice provided by Sarah O'Bradaigh (senior solicitor) on 01/12/2021.
Finance Advice:	Advice provided by Susan Turner (Senior Commercial Business Partner) on 16/12/2021. Advice documents: Electric CCTV Vehicle Purchase - Finance Comments.docx
IT Advice:	The IT Service will provide support to the Parking Regulation and Compliance Service with this acquisition as requested on a standard project basis. At this time there are no IT related concerns with the proposed action. Advice provided by Paul J. Burrows (IT Change, Projects & Strategy Manager) on 30/11/2021.
Procurement Advice:	Procurement Comments: 3 quotes were sought from a value for money perspective and procurement supports the decision to be taken in this report. The 3 quotes were not sought via the e-tendering system and are therefore not in compliance with Contract Procedure Rules; Article 18 paragraph 18.58 but the Head of Contracting and Procurement has agreed to approve the purchase on this occasion but notes that any future requirements must be sought via the e-tendering system. Advice provided by Paul Ritchie (Procurement Manager) on 29/11/2021.
Signatures	Neghat Khan (PH Neighbourhoods, Safety and Inclusion) SIGNED and Dated: 21/01/2022 Frank Jordan (Corporate Director, Resident Services) SIGNED and Dated: 20/01/2022