

PERMIT SCHEME FORMAL CONSULTATION REPORT

Title: Cambridgeshire County Council Permit Scheme consultation responses and report
Date: April 2016
Authors: Jason Setford-Smith, Consultant

1 Introduction

The formal consultation regarding the proposed Cambridgeshire County Council Permit Scheme ('CPS') ran for a period of eight (8) weeks beginning on the 28th January 2016. The deadline for receipt of responses was no later than 5pm on 28th March 2016.

It was stated in the consultation covering letter that 'all responses received by the 28th March 2016 will be taken into consideration and, if Cambridgeshire County Council consider it to be appropriate, amendments will be made to the draft Permit Scheme.

The draft Scheme Document and accompanying covering letter was issued to ?? key stakeholder organisations, including local neighbouring Highway Authorities, Utilities, road user representative groups, current IT suppliers and non-government organisations. The list is provided within this document.

Some organisations had a number of consultees within them and if known those individuals were contacted directly. The total number of email addresses / individual contacts made was ??.

A total of ?? individual comments on the proposed Permit Scheme were received by the deadline.

Any additional comments from EToN developers, consultants and legal representatives have been added to the comment list so there is transparency regarding all changes to the scheme document.

A list of comments received and potential response or amendments are provided in this document.

1 List of Consultees who responded by the deadline

- 1) Anglian Joint Utilities Group (AJUG)
- 2) Cambridge Water (CW)
- 3) Cambridgeshire Police (CP)
- 4) Virgin Media (VM)
- 5) Anglian Water Services Ltd (AW)
- 6) UK Power Networks (UKPN)
- 7) Huntingdonshire District Council (HDC)
- 8) Skanska (Sk)
- 9) EToN Developers Group as part of the EToN Compliance Check (EDG)
- 10) Consultant - Permit Scheme Development (Co)

Consultees who responded after the deadline

No Consultees responded after the deadline.

2 Consultation Distribution List

Internal Contacts	
Sonia Hansen	Chris Stromberg
Helen Hollebon	Kelly Estanol
James Barwise	Richard Lumley
Nicki Mason	Juliet Richardson

Bus Operators	
Arriva	Stagecoach
Whippet	

Central Government	
Department for Transport	Highways England
Environment Agency	

Emergency Services	
Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service	Cambridgeshire Ambulance Service
Cambridgeshire Police	

IT and Systems Suppliers	
Symology	

Passenger Transport	
Network Rail	Passenger Focus

Representative and Interest Groups	
Approved Driving Instructors Association	Passenger Focus Group

Automobile Association	Road Haulage Association
British Cycling	Road Safety Partnership
British Motorcyclists Federation (BMF) South – David Howe	Royal Association for Deaf People (RAD)
Chamber of Commerce	Royal Automobile Club
Freight Transport Association	Royal Blind Society
Guide Dogs Association for the Blind	Cambridge Private Hire Association
Joint Authorities Group	Wheelchair User Group
Cambridgeshire Road Safety Partnership	Cambridge Hackney Carriage Association

Surrounding Local Authorities	
Peterborough City Council	Hertfordshire County Council
Suffolk County Council	Norfolk County Council
Northamptonshire County Council	Bedford Borough Council
Essex County Council	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Fenland District Council	Cambridge City Council
East Cambridgeshire District Council	Huntingdonshire District Council

Utility Companies	
Virgin Media	Anglian Water Services
Verizon Business	British Telecom PLC
National Grid (GAS Distribution)	Balfour Beatty Utility Solutions Ltd
Ericsson	British Waterways
KCOM Group PLC	BskyB Telecom Services
Gamma Telecom	Colt Communications
National Joint Utilities Group	Western Power Distribution
Cable and Wireless	Cambridge Water
UKPN	Skanska

Service Providers	
Skanska	Balfour Beatty

S50 Contacts
Acrabuild (Anglia) Ltd
ADBly Construction Ltd
Adroit Utilities Ltd
ADS Groundworks Ltd
AWH Utility Services Ltd
B J Plant Ltd
B W Cook Construction Ltd
Best of British
Bowie Construction Ltd
Cage Cable Contractors Ltd
C B Groundworks & Construction Ltd
CG Godfrey Ltd
Claret Civil Engineering Ltd
D J Elwood
DAB Civil Engineering Ltd
Dockerill Group
F J Morris Contracting Ltd
Future Utility Solutions
Garrod Construction Ltd
Hawkes Plant Ltd
Henry Construction
Hills Contractors Ltd
Manterfield Drilling Ltd
Mawco Construction
Melcon Services Ltd
N J C Utilities & Construction
P E Coles Ltd
PDI Utilities
PGR Construction
Phil Brannigan Groundworks Ltd
RJM Elite Building Ltd

S P Bardwells Ltd
SDC Builders Ltd
Squire Energy Ltd
Steve Counce Ltd
Tamdown Ltd
Target Plant Hire Ltd
TJ Wood Groundworks Ltd
UCPC Ltd
UKDN Waterflow
Waugh and McKean Limited

3 General Comments

Org	Suggested amendment / clarification / comment / question	Response / action / recommendation
CP	<p>Thank you for your 'e' correspondence in relation to the above named proposal. Please accept this as confirmation and acknowledgement of receipt and that statutory consultation with the Chief Officer has taken place.</p> <p>What is intended by the highway authority has been fully examined by the traffic management unit.</p> <p>On behalf of the Chief Officer, and from a police traffic management perspective and in the interests of coordination, efficiency and the minimising of disruption, this proposal is fully supported.</p>	<p>Thank you for your response which we appreciate.</p>
Sk	<p>Further to the earlier consultation presentation Skanska kindly request further information on the proposed permitting requirements expected of the service provider.</p> <p>We suggest it might be prudent to arrange a separate meeting where-by permitting requirements can be discussed and parameters understood.</p>	<p>Noted and meetings will be held.</p>
HDC	<p>We have considered the County Council proposals in discussions with the Executive Councillor for Strategic Planning and Housing, and we are pleased to confirm that this Council fully supports the proposed Cambridgeshire Permit Scheme.</p> <p>We strongly support the stated aims of introducing this scheme in order to allow CCC a new way in which to manage road works within the public highway and to allow the County Council to better minimise disruption to highway users.</p>	<p>Noted and thank you for the positive response.</p>
AJUG	<p>The permit scheme should not be implemented on a Monday as we are catching up with emergency works from the weekend on a Monday morning.</p>	<p>This will be considered and discussed with stakeholders.</p>
AJUG	<p>We are pleased to see the scheme is based on the Norfolk and Essex schemes as that does bring a level of consistency within the Anglian region,</p> <p>Consistency would be greatly improved if the three schemes were part of a common or joint scheme rather than three single schemes which we would welcome.</p> <p>In section 1.4.1 it stated that this scheme is similar to Essex and Norfolk permit</p>	<p>The scheme is consistent, where possible and appropriate, with regard to its operation.</p>

	<p>schemes. Norfolk and Essex both have a fee reduction for non-immediate permits for Section 81 if the works are completed within a set timeframe.</p> <p>Cambridge permit scheme does not have this provision and I think it would be a valuable addition to the scheme and would meet the sub-objectives “ensure safety of those using the street” and “to protect the structure of the street and integrity of the apparatus in it”.</p> <p>Norfolk also have a reduce permit fee where works promoters finish X number of reinstatements to a permanent reinstatement on the first visit and where they have less than X% of failures on the coring programme within 1 year. This is a great incentive not only to improve the quality of reinstatements but to reduce disruption by encouraging first time permanent reinstatements. This incentive would be a great addition to the scheme and if the coring element was too restrictive, it could include provision for x% visual failures from the inspection regime. It would also meet the principle objective of the permit scheme.</p>	<p>Noted, the Scheme reserves the right to waive and discount fees and will discuss and consider these elements as the scheme develops.</p>
AJUG	<p>We believe that Cambridgeshire should carry out their TSS review prior to the permit scheme being implemented so that utilities can forecast costs, and no have changes after the scheme has gone live.</p>	<p>As the Highway Network evolves and traffic grows the Traffic Sensitive Streets (TSS) and Associated Street Data will be updated and maintained regularly, in consultation with stakeholders, so it is as up to date and accurate as possible.</p>
CW	<p>In section 1.4.1 it stated that this scheme is similar to Essex and Norfolk permit schemes. Norfolk and Essex both have a fee reduction for non-immediate permits for Section 81 if the works are completed within a set timeframe. Cambridge permit scheme does not have this provision and I think it would be a valuable addition to the scheme and would meet the sub-objectives “ensure safety of those using the street” and “to protect the structure of the street and integrity of the apparatus in it”.</p>	<p>Please refer to response to AJUG comments relating to discounts</p>
CW	<p>Norfolk also have a reduce permit fee where works promoters finish X number of reinstatements to a permanent reinstatement on the first visit and where they have less than X% of failures on the coring programme within 1 year. This is a great incentive not only to improve the quality of reinstatements but to reduce disruption by encouraging first time permanent reinstatements. This incentive would be a great addition to the scheme and if the coring element was too restrictive, it could include provision for x% visual failures from the inspection regime. It would also meet the principle objective of the permit scheme.</p>	<p>Please refer to response to AJUG comments relating to discounts</p>
CW	<p>Cambridge Water does not operate in any other highway authority area and therefore the permit scheme regime will require substantial training and re-assessment of all street</p>	<p>Permit Fees will not be waived as they reflect costs. Sanctions will be recorded but not charged for a period</p>

	works procedures and processes. With this in mind, will there be a trial period or stay of execution whereby permit fees will be waived and/or penalty notices for breach of conditions etc. will be waived for the first 1-3 months so that all works promoters can adjust to the change?	of 1 month to allow for bedding in of the scheme.
VM	As you are aware all new permit schemes now have to follow the January 2013 DfT Additional Advice Note for developing and operating Permit Schemes focusing only on the busiest streets (strategically significant streets). Permit authorities must also encourage works promoters to work wholly outside of traffic-sensitive times by offering discounted fees. By following DfT advice both the Council and works promoters will be able to focus on working together to plan those works likely to cause the most disruption, rather than a blanket approach including streets that are not traffic-sensitive.	The scheme does focus on strategically significant streets. Charges for Cat 0-2 TSS streets are higher than for Cat 3-4 non TSS streets.
AW	<p>The revenue received from utilities should not cover the cost for running the whole scheme, including administration for your own works. The utility income should only cover the administrative activities connected to utility permit applications.</p> <p>Why is only the delay cost for utility works included in the summary of appraisal, this should show parity and include Highways works as well.</p> <p>The permit fees should only cover the difference between the cost of running a noticing team and the cost of running a permitting team, not the full team costs. You do not state your current costs.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire's Street Works Department was self supporting and the annual Operating Expenditure was <£500,000. The additional income generated supported other business areas within the Traffic Managers Team. The figures shown do not reflect the "as is" and show the additional costs when they move to Permits.</p> <p>Unless additional costs are incurred over and above the existing expenditure they cannot be regarded as part of the scheme e.g. having to renting additional accommodation rather than occupying already owned premises (Staff reductions have freed up a lot of room in Authority owned Buildings!)</p> <p>The saving benefits are more than over estimated and double accounted. The suggestion that Consumer Travel Time and Business Travel Time can be separated in two distinct areas is pure speculation and according to the model account for 93% of the benefit! The benefits can not be substantiated. The reduction in fuel revenue is underestimated as fuel prices currently have decreased by at least 30%</p> <p>I have seen no evidence or case studies to show permit schemes reduce the number of</p>	<p>Fees only cover the cost of the additional resources and administration of operating the Permit Scheme.</p> <p>The scheme cost is derived from a completed Permit Fees Matrix in a format provided by the DfT.</p> <p>This is the case.</p> <p>Benefits Summary Values are a result of Transport Economic Efficiency (TEE) table reports on user benefits by consumer and business sections for time, fuel and non-fuel vehicle operating impacts.</p> <p>Vehicle operating costs (VOC) and the Cost Benefit Analysis has been prepared with 2010 as the price</p>

	accidents on the highway	base year for presentation values as set out in DfT WebTAG guidance.
AW	The permit scheme should not be implemented on a Monday as we are catching up with emergency works from the weekend on a Monday morning.	This will be considered and discussed with all stakeholders.

4 Scheme Document comments

Org	Document Section	Suggested amendment / clarification / comment / question	Response / reply / recommendation
Section 1: Background			
CON	1.2	Amendment to clarify organisation running the scheme as a single Permit Scheme and proposed date of commencement	Amended
CON	1.3	Clarification regarding related legislation	Amended
CW	1.4.1	Norfolk, Essex and Cambridge permit schemes are individual schemes with different objectives and different instances where discounted permit fees apply. This does not provide consistency for works promoters. Consistency would be greatly improved if the three schemes were part of a common or joint scheme rather than three single schemes.	The scheme is consistent, where possible and appropriate, with regard to its operation.
AJUG	1.4.3	This paragraph has been replaced by section 1.21 in the Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes (October 2015): "It is most likely that schemes will apply permits to 100% of the network, with fees being waived or discounted on lower priority roads. Schemes may also choose to operate permits only across the areas largely defined by its strategically significant streets".	Charges for Cat 0-2 TSS streets are higher than for Cat 3-4 non TSS streets.
CW	1.4.3	The additional guidance issued in January 2013 has been replaced by Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes (October	Charges for Cat 0-2 TSS streets are higher than for Cat

		<p>2015) and the Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes – Permit Scheme Conditions (March 2015).</p> <p><i>“It is considered that in order to best manage the network, schemes are likely to choose to apply permits either to 100% of the network, but waive or discount part or all of the fees on non-strategically significant streets, or to operate a permit scheme across the areas largely defined by its strategically significant streets”</i></p> <p>This paragraph has been replaced by section 1.21 in the Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes (October 2015): “It is most likely that schemes will apply permits to 100% of the network, with fees being waived or discounted on lower priority roads. Schemes may also choose to operate permits only across the areas largely defined by its strategically significant streets”.</p>	3-4 non TSS streets.
AJUG	1.5.5	<p>AJUG are disappointed that Cambridgeshire County Council’s Permit Scheme and associated fee`s will apply to all classification of roads. If the council chooses to apply permits to 100% of streets, contrary to advice from Ministers, we requests that Cambridgeshire County Council grant permits for category 3 and 4 roads by default and for those permits to be at zero fee levels.</p>	<p>Charges for Cat 0-2 TSS streets are higher than for Cat 3-4 non TSS streets.</p> <p>This is in line with Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes (October 2015)</p>
VM	1.5.5	<p>Virgin Media are disappointed that Cambridgeshire County Council’s Permit Scheme and associated fee`s will apply to all classification of roads. If the council chooses to apply permits to 100% of streets, contrary to advice from Ministers, Virgin Media requests that Cambridgeshire County Council grant permits for category 3 and 4 roads by default and for those permits to be at zero fee levels.</p>	<p>Charges for Cat 0-2 TSS streets are higher than for Cat 3-4 non TSS streets.</p> <p>This is in line with Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes (October 2015)</p>
AJUG	1.5.9	<p>Will additional permits be required if traffic light heads are needed on roads other than the road you are working in for multi way lights set up. The placing of traffic light heads is not a registerable activity under the legislation. If these additional permits are required, will they be charged for</p>	<p>Where it is deemed that activities that are not registerable no permit will be required.</p>
AW	1.5.9	<p>Will additional permits be required if traffic light heads are needed on roads other than the road you are working in for multi way lights set up. The placing of traffic light heads is not a registerable activity under the legislation. If these additional permits are required, will they be</p>	<p>Please refer to response earlier relating to 1.5.9</p>

		charged for	
Section 2: Objectives and Benefits of the Permit Scheme			
CW	2.5.3	<p>In section 2.5.3 there are seven sub-objectives listed. The permit scheme document does not explain how the scheme will collect information, measure, report on and evaluate said information to ensure the scheme is meeting the sub-objectives.</p> <p>The seven KPIs mentioned in section 4.2 have been designed by HAUC (England) Permit Forum as a basic reporting mechanism and will not be adequate to measure sub-objectives such as “to manage road works and street works to support public transport (including buses) reliability and punctuality” or “to ensure the safety of those using the street and those working on activities that fall under the scheme, with particular emphasis on people with disabilities”.</p> <p>Section 2.9 in the Statutory Guidance (Oct 2015) states that “In addition authorities may wish to use their own KPIs – aligned with their objectives.” The Cambridge Permit Scheme document does not detail any additional KPIs that will be used to evaluate the schemes sub-objectives.</p>	<p>An annual review of the scheme will be published within 3 months of the anniversary date.</p> <p>A range of KPIs including those agreed locally and nationally will be used to measure the scheme against objectives.</p>
AJUG	2.5.3	<p>The permit scheme document does not explain how the scheme will collect information, measure, report on and evaluate said information to ensure the scheme is meeting the sub-objectives.</p> <p>The seven KPIs mentioned in section 4.2 have been designed by HAUC (England) Permit Forum as a basic reporting mechanism and will not be adequate to measure sub-objectives such as “to manage road works and street works to support public transport (including buses) reliability and punctuality” or “to ensure the safety of those using the street and those working on activities that fall under the scheme, with particular emphasis on people with disabilities”.</p> <p>Section 2.9 in the Statutory Guidance (Oct 2015) states that “In addition authorities may wish to use their own KPIs – aligned with their objectives.” The Cambridge Permit Scheme document does not detail any additional KPIs that will be used to evaluate the schemes sub- objectives.</p>	<p>An annual review of the scheme will be published within 3 months of the anniversary date.</p> <p>A range of KPIs including those agreed locally and nationally will be used to measure the scheme against objectives.</p>

VM	2.5.3 3.5, 3.6 &3.7.1	Virgin Media believes that this is equally achieved through the mandatory NRSWA coordination and cooperation requirements at much less cost to works promoters and their customers, without the need for a Permit Scheme.	Your comment is noted.
AJUG	2.5.3 3.5, 3.6 & 3.7.1	AJUG believes that this is equally achieved through the mandatory NRSWA coordination and cooperation requirements at much less cost to works promoters and their customers, without the need for a Permit Scheme.	Your comment is noted.
AJUG	2.6.2	<p><i>Meeting the challenges of climate change and enhancing the natural environment: The County Council is committed to achieving its Air Quality targets, however these cannot be realised if traffic is managed</i> - Should read “unless” traffic is managed.</p> <p>The County Council cannot solely lay this statement at the feet of Undertakers. Their planners are increasing disruption and poor air quality by introducing and allowing poor road design such as more junctions for developments along already over capacity commuter routes</p> <p>The permit scheme document does not explain how the scheme will collect information, measure, report on and evaluate said information to ensure the scheme is meeting the aligned objectives.</p>	<p>2.6.2. amended for clarification</p> <p>An annual review of the scheme will be published within 3 months of the anniversary date.</p> <p>A range of KPIs including those agreed locally and nationally will be used to measure the scheme against objectives.</p>
CW	2.6.2	<p>In section 2.6.2 there are five aligned objectives listed. The permit scheme document does not explain how the scheme will collect information, measure, report on and evaluate said information to ensure the scheme is meeting the aligned objectives.</p> <p>The seven KPIs mentioned in section 4.2 have been designed by HAUC (England) Permit Forum as a basic reporting mechanism and will not be adequate to measure the aligned objectives.</p> <p>Section 2.9 in the Statutory Guidance (Oct 2015) states that “In addition authorities may wish to use their own KPIs – aligned with their objectives.” The Cambridge Permit Scheme document does not detail any additional KPIs that will be used to evaluate the schemes aligned objectives.</p>	<p>An annual review of the scheme will be published within 3 months of the anniversary date.</p> <p>A range of KPIs including those agreed locally and nationally will be used to measure the scheme against objectives.</p>

AW	2.6.2	<p><i>Meeting the challenges of climate change and enhancing the natural environment: The County Council is committed to achieving its Air Quality targets, however these cannot be realised if traffic is managed</i></p> <p>- Should read “unless” traffic is managed.</p> <p>The County Council cannot solely lay this statement at the feet of Undertakers. Their planners are increasing disruption and poor air quality by introducing and allowing poor road design such as more junctions for developments along already over capacity commuter routes</p>	Please refer to response earlier relating to 2.6.2
EDG	2.6.2	<p><i>Meeting the challenges of climate change and enhancing the natural environment: The County Council is committed to achieving its Air Quality targets, however these cannot be realised if traffic is managed</i></p> <p><i>Should this read “if traffic is not managed”? Also, no full stop on two of the bullet points.</i></p>	Please refer to response earlier relating to 2.6.2
Section 3: Permit Scheme Principles for Co-ordination			
CW	3.7.4	Cambridge Water fully supports this section of the permit scheme document and will endeavour to maximise opportunities to collaborate with other works promoters.	Noted and thank you for the positive response.
UKPN	3.12	<p>Permit Statutory Guidance - for category* 0, 1, 2, and traffic-sensitive streets, the planned commencement date and finishing date for the activity are the start date and end dates respectively on the permit. The permit will not be valid before the start date on the permit and will cease to be valid once the end date has passed;</p> <p>Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes - Permit Scheme Conditions NCT01a (For the activities hereby permitted it is a condition of this permit that activities shall not commence before the Proposed Start Date or in the case of Immediate Works the Actual Start Date contained in the application for immediate works and must end by the Estimated End Date provided on this permit. The Proposed Start Date, Actual Start Date and Estimated End Date are as defined in the current EToN specification.)</p> <p>a) 10.1 a) The Street - An application shall relate to proposed activities in one street only. A street for these purposes must</p>	<p>3.12 Noted</p> <p>a)10.1 a) Agreed</p>

		correspond to a USRN. Not where a provisional street is used, in which case, USRN is not provided. ETS 5.2.2	
Section 4: Key Performance Indicators and Evaluation of Scheme Success			
CW	4.2	As per Section 2.8 of the Statutory Guidance (Oct 2015), a set of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) has been developed by the HAUC (England) Permit Forum. The KPIs themselves are not within regulations and therefore they will not be “amended, removed or replaced by future amendments to Permit Regulations”.	A range of KPIs including those agreed locally and nationally will be used to measure the scheme against objectives. Noted, however the scheme document allows such flexibility around future amendments to statutory guidance and in 4.3 to HAUC recommendations and requirements around KPI’s
AJUG	4.3	I would strongly recommend the use of the KPI report that has been developed by Norfolk, which is sent out every month	A range of KPIs including those agreed locally and nationally will be used to measure the scheme against objectives.
CW	4.3	How will the KPI results be shared? Will they be sent to local HAUC representatives or direct to each works promoter?	An annual review of the scheme will be published within 3 months of the anniversary date. It is intended to publish such results on the County Council’s website, however information will also be supplied to local utility contacts where required.
AW	4.3	I would strongly recommend the use of the KPI report that has been developed by Norfolk, which is sent out every month	A range of KPIs including those agreed locally and nationally will be used to measure the scheme against objectives.
AJUG	4.4	The paragraph is outdated – The data is submitted to Geoplace Quarterly	4.4 Amended
AW	4.4	The paragraph is outdated – The data is submitted to Geoplace Quarterly	4.4 Amended
CW	4.6	What are the key objectives? The document makes reference to a “strategic objective” in section 2.5.1, sub-objectives in section 2.5.3 and aligned objectives in 2.6. The report template is not published in the Statutory Guidance (Oct 2015), it has been developed by the	Key Objectives are derived from a range of specific and general objectives and will be detailed in the Evaluation report as elements may evolve over time. These Key Objectives could include the Objectives shown in the

		<p>Permit Forum and has been sent to HAUC for publication this week. It will be in the form of a HAUC (England) Advice Note.</p> <p><i>“Such guidance and templates may change from time to time. Such a report may include the use of the following:</i></p> <p><i>a) KPIs as described in Section 4 of this document.</i></p> <p><i>b) HAUC TPI (The Permit Indicators) Measures as defined and agreed by the National Permit Forum which may be subject to change from time to time”.</i></p> <p>The “KPIs as described in Section 4 of this document” are exactly the same as the “HAUC TPI (The Permit Indicators) Measures. The seven indicators have been developed by the HAUC (England) Permit Forum.</p> <p><i>c) Authority Measures which will include further data collated by the Permit Authority to support the objectives of this scheme. Such measures will be defined and agreed by the National Permit Forum and as above, may be subject to change from time to time.</i></p> <p>There is a requirement under regulation 4(d) as amended by the 2015 regulations that before developing a permit scheme the authorities must consider how they propose to evaluate the scheme, so as to demonstrate whether its objectives have been met. This document does not detail the “additional measures” that will be used to measure the objectives of the scheme. The HAUC (England) Permit Forum has not been set up to agree individual scheme KPIs. The KPIs should be developed by the council and documented in this scheme.</p>	<p>scheme document along with operational objectives such as sound financial management and responding to all applications.</p>
--	--	--	---

Section 5: Common Elements with NRSWA

AJUG	5.5 / 5.6	<p>Cambridgeshire are not reviewing the traffic sensitive streets prior to implementation of the permit scheme, if the traffic sensitivity changes after the permit scheme has commenced, changes to the scheme and fee’s will need to go through a formal consultation process and a new order issued, in addition to consultation on the proposed changes to the traffic sensitive streets.</p> <p>The permit scheme should not fund something that the Highway Authority should have previously maintained at the expense of the</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>As the Highway Network evolves and traffic grows the Traffic Sensitive Streets (TSS) and Associated Street Data will be updated and maintained regularly, in consultation with stakeholders, so it is as up to date and accurate as possible.</p>
------	-----------	---	--

		Promoters.	
AW	5.5 / 5.6	<p>Cambridgeshire are not reviewing the traffic sensitive streets prior to implementation of the permit scheme, if the traffic sensitivity changes after the permit scheme has commenced, changes to the scheme and fee's will need to go through a formal consultation process and a new order issued, in addition to consultation on the proposed changes to the traffic sensitive streets.</p> <p>The permit scheme should not fund something that the Highway Authority should have previously maintained at the expense of the Promoters.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>As the Highway Network evolves and traffic grows the Traffic Sensitive Streets (TSS) and Associated Street Data will be updated and maintained regularly, in consultation with stakeholders, so it is as up to date and accurate as possible.</p>
AJUG	5.7.2	<p>5.5 / 5.6 above details why the reinstatement category cannot be relied upon and as such cannot be treated as definitive. The current ASD held on the Gazetteer may put promoters at a disadvantage in that the level of charge may be higher than its correct status.</p> <p>Section 1.27 of the Statutory Guidance (Oct 2015) states that "The specification for street gazetteers is set out in British Standard BS 7666. It is important that permit schemes make sure their street gazetteer is upgraded at least to level 3 of that standard".</p> <p>Section 1.28 of the Statutory Guidance (Oct 2015) states that "Prior to introducing a permit scheme, and at regular intervals after that, the authority should carry out a thorough review of their NSG".</p> <p>Therefore it is reasonable to expect that the authority updates the NSG and ensure that all streets have the correct reinstatement category entered against it.</p>	<p>As the Highway Network evolves and traffic grows the Traffic Sensitive Streets (TSS) and Associated Street Data will be updated and maintained regularly, in consultation with stakeholders, so it is as up to date and accurate as possible.</p>
CW	5.7.2	<p>Section 1.27 of the Statutory Guidance (Oct 2015) states that "The specification for street gazetteers is set out in British Standard BS 7666. It is important that permit schemes make sure their street gazetteer is upgraded at least to level 3 of that standard".</p> <p>Section 1.28 of the Statutory Guidance (Oct 2015) states that "Prior to introducing a permit scheme, and at regular intervals after that, the authority should carry out a thorough review of their NSG".</p> <p>Therefore it is reasonable to expect that the authority updates the NSG and ensure that all streets have the correct reinstatement</p>	<p>As the Highway Network evolves and traffic grows the Traffic Sensitive Streets (TSS) and Associated Street Data will be updated and maintained regularly, in consultation with stakeholders, so it is as up to date and accurate as possible.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

		category entered against it.	
AW	5.7.2	5.5 / 5.6 above details why the reinstatement category cannot be relied upon and as such cannot be treated as definitive. The current ASD held on the Gazetteer may put promoters at a disadvantage in that the level of charge may be higher than its correct status.	As the Highway Network evolves and traffic grows the Traffic Sensitive Streets (TSS) and Associated Street Data will be updated and maintained regularly, in consultation with stakeholders, so it is as up to date and accurate as possible.
Section 6: Permit Scope			
AJUG	6.1	As 1.5.9 above	Noted
AW	6.1	As 1.5.9 above	Noted
AJUG	6.2	The 2007 Permit Regulations do not define specified works as the works listed a-g in section 6.2 of the permit scheme document. Regulation 6 (1) states “A permit scheme shall specify the works (or types of works) which that permit scheme is designed to control (which shall be the “specified works” for the purposes of that permit scheme).	6.2 Amended
CW	6.2	The 2007 Permit Regulations do not define specified works as the works listed a-g in section 6.2 of the permit scheme document. Regulation 6 (1) states “A permit scheme shall specify the works (or types of works) which that permit scheme is designed to control (which shall be the “specified works” for the purposes of that permit scheme).	6.2 Amended
AJUG	6.9 shown in 1113.1	If the Authority doesn’t respond to the permit application within the timescales set in the TMA, then the permit will be classed as deemed and works can commence, therefore the promoter will not be committing an offence.	6.9 Amended for clarification
VM	6.9 shown in 1113.1	If the Authority doesn’t respond to the permit application within the timescales set in the TMA, then the permit will be classed as deemed and works can commence, therefore the promoter will not be committing an offence.	6.9 Amended for clarification
Section 7: Types of Permit			

AJUG	7.2	<p>The paragraphs are misleading: -</p> <p>a) Would suggest that an early start cannot be granted and that the works cannot finish early.</p> <p>b) Would appear to be extra flexible allowing the start to be + or – 5 days for major/standard works or + or – 2 days for minor.</p>	<p>a) It is not felt that the wording does not suggest that works cannot be completed before the end date, however amended for clarification</p> <p>b) is clear and also relates to NRSWA validity windows</p>
AW	7.2	<p>The paragraphs are misleading: -</p> <p>a) Would suggest that an early start cannot be granted and that the works cannot finish early.</p> <p>b) Would appear to be extra flexible allowing the start to be + or – 5 days for major/standard works or + or – 2 days for minor.</p>	Please refer to response to 7.2 above
UKPN	7.3.2	<p>Conflict in legislation; ETS 8.4 Permit Regimes Only – For Non Traffic Sensitive streets of Category 3 and 4, the start date for the permit duration may be slipped as shown above; for other streets, no slippage is allowed, and the duration of the permit must apply from the proposed start date.</p>	7.3.2 does not relate to this matter, please refer to response above
AJUG	7.3.2	<p>In relation to category 0, 1, 2, and traffic sensitive streets, the planned commencement date and finishing date for the activity are the start date and end date respectively on the permit. The permit is not valid before the start date on the permit and ceases to be valid once the end date has passed.</p> <p>Conflict in legislation;</p> <p>ETS 8.4 Permit Regimes Only – For Non Traffic Sensitive streets of Category 3 and 4, the start date for the permit duration may be slipped as shown above; for other streets, no slippage is allowed, and the duration of the permit must apply from the proposed start date.</p> <p>3.12 Permit Statutory Guidance - for category* 0, 1, 2, and traffic-</p>	<p>As per the response above.</p> <p>The wording relating to 3.12 is accurate and in line with the Permit regulations</p>

		<p>sensitive streets, the planned commencement date and finishing date for the activity are the start date and end dates respectively on the permit. The permit will not be valid before the start date on the permit and will cease to be valid once the end date has passed;</p> <p>Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes - Permit Scheme Conditions NCT01a (For the activities hereby permitted it is a condition of this permit that activities shall not commence before the Proposed Start Date or in the case of Immediate Works the Actual Start Date contained in the application for immediate works and must end by the Estimated End Date provided on this permit. The Proposed Start Date, Actual Start Date and Estimated End Date are as defined in the current EToN specification.)</p>	
Section 8: Permit Applications			
AJUG	8.3	Whilst it is the responsibility of the promoter to apply to each Authority in cross boarder activities it is the responsibility of the Authority's to coordinate the works with each other.	Correct
AW	8.3	Whilst it is the responsibility of the promoter to apply to each Authority in cross boarder activities it is the responsibility of the Authority's to coordinate the works with each other.	Correct
Section 9: How to Make a Permit Application			
AJUG	9.5	Permit Schemes are designed for site-specific and job- specific information and therefore standard durations will not help to achieve the scheme objectives. Each job should be planned (by the promoter) and then assessed (by the authority) on its merits and surely the permit fee covers the work that is completed by the authority in assessing whether the duration is suitable for the work that has been described in the application.	<p>Noted. Every permit will be assessed on its own merits, with time and resource utilised to assess durations,</p> <p>However, in exceptional circumstances, where it is clear that a certain works type, in a certain street type, with a consistent EToN Traffic Management Code is in constant use by an Undertaker, the scheme allows Permit Authority and Undertaker to agree in advance standard durations in advance, as is current industry practice.</p> <p>Whilst the scheme will retain this provision, based upon</p>

			the AJUG response any current agreements relating to durations will cease upon the commencement of the scheme.
CW	9.5	Permit Schemes are designed for site-specific and job-specific information and therefore standard durations will not help to achieve the scheme objectives. Each job should be planned (by the promoter) and then assessed (by the authority) on its merits and surely the permit fee covers the work that is completed by the authority in assessing whether the duration is suitable for the work that has been described in the application.	Please refer to response for 9.5 above
Section 10: Content of Permit Applications			
AJUG	10.1	<p>a) The Street - An application shall relate to proposed activities in one street only. A Street for these purposes must correspond to a USRN. Not where a provisional street is used, in which case, USRN is not provided. ETS 5.2.2</p> <p>e) Duration - Each permit application must include proposed start and end dates of the works (the date from which the Promoter requires the road space until the road space is no longer required). The dates included on the permit are calendar days, not working days.</p> <p>Details of the times of day when the activity is to be carried out must also be provided, - Challenge this as there is no condition to enforce this requirement including any proposal to work at night. If the Promoter proposes to undertake activity on weekends or Bank Holidays to speed up the activity and reduce disruption, this must be included with the application. This information will be taken into account when considering whether to require conditions to be added to the application.</p> <p>Details of the times of day when the activity is to be carried out must also be provided</p>	<p>10.1a Amended for clarification</p> <p>10.1e Amended for clarification</p> <p>10.1f The EToN Technical Spec has provision for the attachments/attachment URL allowing access to plans and illustrations for example, however, whilst this process is encouraged, alternative methods may be used (such as email)</p> <p>10.1g These are part of the mandatory EToN 6 data requirements on any application (Excavation Type and Collaboration fields)</p> <p>10.1i Acknowledged and agreed. However, the EToN process requires relevant conditions to be served upon the application</p> <p>10.1k The scheme will not erode the powers of an undertaker to provide an Interim reinstatement. A permit may be refused or replied to with a Permit Modification Request. This may depend upon the elements and</p>

		<p>It must be explicitly stated within the application if a Promoter wishes to work outside working hours as defined by NRSWA.</p> <p>– Only for planned out of hours working, i.e. not for immediate works. ETS 4.7.8 Note 3 The Working Hours flag is used to alert the street authority to planned out-of-hours working.</p> <p>f) Which section/s in the EToN Technical Specification does it provide this information?</p> <p>g) There is no condition to include this on all permits NTC10a This condition should be used by exception, where the methodology to be used is important to the site conditions.</p> <p>l) Whilst it is noted that it is desirable for the Promoter to include the Proposed Conditions it should be acknowledged that under the legislation it is the responsibility of the Authority to impose the conditions.</p> <p>k) not supported by NCT guidance NCT10a The methodology should be specific to the circumstances of a particular works, for instance, it cannot be used as a standard condition to insist on first time reinstatements on all permit applications</p> <p>Therefore the Authority should not refuse on the grounds alone that no conditions are proposed by the Promoter but issue a PMR giving the required Conditions</p>	number of modifications required to make a modified application suitable for granting.
CW	10.1	Which section/s in the EToN Technical Specification does it provide this information?	Please refer to 10.1 response above
AW	10.1	<p>g) not needed as covered by NCT10</p> <p>l) Whilst it is noted that it is desirable for the Promoter to include the Proposed Conditions it should be acknowledged that under the legislation it is the responsibility of the Authority to impose the conditions.</p> <p>Therefore the Authority should not refuse on the grounds alone that no conditions are proposed by the Promoter but issue a</p>	Please refer to 10.1 response above

		PMR giving the required Conditions	
UKPN	10.1 e)	Duration - Each permit application must include proposed start and end dates of the works (the date from which the Promoter requires the road space until the road space is no longer required). The dates included on the permit are calendar days, not working days. Details of the times of day when the activity is to be carried out must also be provided, - UKPN challenge this as there is no condition to enforce this requirement including any proposal to work at night. If the Promoter proposes to undertake activity on weekends or Bank Holidays to speed up the activity and reduce disruption, this must be included with the application. This information will be taken into account when considering whether to require conditions to be added to the application. It must be explicitly stated within the application if a Promoter wishes to work outside working hours as defined by NRSWA. – Only for planned out of hours working, i.e. not for immediate works. ETS 4.7.8 Note 3 The Working Hours flag is used to alert the street authority to planned out-of-hours working.	Please refer to 10.1 response above
EDG	10.1 (h)	As these two sentences are not specific to bullet point (v), but related to also to the previous bullet points, should they be a separate paragraph rather than part of bullet (v)?	Amended for clarification
AJUG	10.2	i) Refuse the request with an inclusion of a comment to reflect the change required. This will require a new or modified permit application to be submitted by the Promoter. Or Works Data Variation as per ETS.	For planned activities A works a Data Variation will not be possible until a permit has been granted.

UKPN	10.2 g)	Method - Details of the proposed techniques, such as open cut, trench share, minimum dig technique or no dig must be provided. UKPN challenge as there is no condition to include this on all permits NCT10a This condition should be used by exception , where the methodology to be used is important to the site conditions.	Please refer to AJUG response 10.1 above
UKPN	10.2 k)	Reinstatement Type - The application should, wherever possible, indicate whether the activity is intended to be completed with interim or permanent reinstatement or a mixture of both. UKPN challenge this as not supported by NCT guidance NCT10a The methodology should be specific to the circumstances of a particular works, for instance, it cannot be used as a standard condition to insist on first time reinstatements on all permit applications [see paragraph 5 of this guidance document	Please refer to AJUG response 10.1 above
UKPN	10.2 i)	Refuse the request with an inclusion of a comment to reflect the change required. This will require a new or modified permit application to be submitted by the Promoter. Or Works Data Variation as per ETS.	Please refer to response above
AJUG	10.2.3	NCT guidance no longer requires linked permits to be referenced in any condition	Noted. 10.2.3 is a requirement not a condition
EDG	10.2.2	Strictly, you could argue that it is "every permit application that is granted."	Amended
UKPN	10.2.3	For all permits it is a requirement that where there are any other linked permits, references to those other linked permits must also be included with the permit. NCT guidance no longer requires linked permits to be referenced in any condition	Please refer to response to 10.2.3 above
UKPN	10.2.6	The Permit Scheme requires all granted permits to be placed on the Permit Register and copied to any undertaker, authority or	ETS refers to restricted information that should not be 'publicly' available, not information that is required or

		other relevant body that has asked to be informed about activities on a particular street. Except where notices are marked as Restricted as per ETS 3.15	requested by for example, an Authority who has an interest in that street.
Section 11: Timings of Permit Applications			
AJUG	11.9.2	Will there be a dedicated number, is this required 24/7, will a PIN be issued for audit trail and to demonstrate call was made. Will contact number be on EToN? How will it affect utilities regulated response commitment as we cannot always wait for a phone agreement especially in safety issues	Currently there are no such designations recorded on the Council NSG submission. However, if amendments are made in the future, it is the intention of the council to provide further clarification to all promoters with regards to points highlighted. This requirement will not be used to delay or stop immediate activities from commencing however if utilised the Authority will be able to react and co-ordinate appropriately.
AW	11.9.2	Will there be a dedicated number, is this required 24/7, will a PIN be issued for audit trail and to demonstrate call was made.	Please refer to response 11.9.2 above
AJUG	11.10.2	Some works may not fall into the immediate category but it would be better to carry out the work sooner rather than later e.g. to prevent further damage to the highway or to assist a customer. Where early starts are requested, they should not be refused unreasonably. It is within both authority and promoter interests to keep customers and the travelling public happy.	Noted
CW	11.10.2	Some works may not fall into the immediate category but it would be better to carry out the work sooner rather than later e.g. to prevent further damage to the highway or to assist a customer. Where early starts are requested, they should not be refused unreasonably. It is within both authority and promoter interests to keep customers and the travelling public happy.	Noted
EDG	11.13.3	The wording “within the response period for the permit application” seems to imply that you will always respond to a Traffic Signals application within permit response times, e.g. if a TS application is made with Minor works, you will respond within the two day response time. Is this OK? Or would you want them to submit the Minor works permit application with longer notice period? If the latter, should this	Minor amendment made for clarification

		be mentioned here?	
Section 12: Decisions with Regards to Permit Applications			
AJUG	12.4 / 12.5	Will national response codes be used in this scheme; the issue of a PMR should always be considered before a refusal.	National codes, when published, will be utilised. A permit may be refused or replied to with a Permit Modification Request. This may depend upon the elements and number of modifications required to make a modified application suitable for granting.
AW	12.4 / 12.5	Will national response codes be used in this scheme, the issue of a PMR should always be considered before a refusal.	Please refer to response 12.4.12.5 above
AJUG	12.5.1	All refusals should have a response code attached to help with evaluation of the scheme objectives. It also aids the works promoter assess the quality of their planning teams. There are 17 response codes that have been developed by HAUC (England) Permit Forum and these should cover all eventualities.	Noted
CW	12.5.1	All refusals should have a response code attached to help with evaluation of the scheme objectives. It also aids the works promoter assess the quality of their planning teams. There are 17 response codes that have been developed by HAUC (England) Permit Forum and these should cover all eventualities.	Noted
AJUG	12.5.2	<p>Section 58/58A Restrictions – this should be qualified rather than a blanket approach as it should not be a bar to emergency or urgent works allowed under the Act, or customer connections for which we have regulated time frames.</p> <p>Where there are conflicting activities/events, environmental considerations, missing conditions etc. wouldn't it be within the interests of the authority to send a permit modification request stating alternative dates, times, methods, conditions instead of refusing the application? This would open up dialogue between the authority and promoter</p>	<p>Noted regarding Section 58/58a</p> <p>Whilst EToN will be utilised to respond to Permit Applications and PAA's, the Authority and Undertaker may open dialogue prior to the use of EToN. Therefore relevant and accurate contact details upon a Permit Application or PAA are an important factor.</p> <p>A Permit Modification Request cannot be issued under EToN against a Provisional Advanced Authorisation as</p>

			<p>a PAA is not a 'Permit'.</p> <p>Each Permit will be assessed individually and the Permit may be 'refused' via a Refused Permit Notice, or 'refused' via a Permit Modification Request Notice. Either is a refusal and works cannot commence on the relevant works reference without a new/modified application being made and a granted application in response (or if the subsequent permit is deemed). However, where minor changes are required, that in particular are not related to dates/conflicts/durations/conflicting or inaccurate data, the preferred method of the PMR will be utilised where possible. However, where promoters decide to unreasonably delay responses to PMRs, this policy may be reviewed.</p>
CW	12.5.2	Where there are conflicting activities/events, environmental considerations, missing conditions etc. wouldn't it be within the interests of the authority to send a permit modification request stating alternative dates, times, methods, conditions instead of refusing the application? This would open up dialogue between the authority and promoter.	Please refer to response 12.5.2 above
AW	12.5.2	Section 58/58A Restrictions – this should be qualified rather than a blanket approach as it should not be a bar to emergency or urgent works allowed under the Act, or customer connections for which we have regulated time frames.	Please refer to response 12.5.2 above
AJUG	12.5.3	<p>Duration challenge should be challenged to a duration no shorter than the minimum allowed for minor works i.e. 3 days</p> <p>Would the authority suggest an alternative method of working to complete the job more "speedily"? . This ties in with why standard durations (as mentioned in 9.5) should not be encouraged because</p>	<p>A minor works may be maximum duration of 3 working days in duration. 3 working days is not the minimum as suggested.</p> <p>Each Permit will be assessed as mentioned in 9.5.</p>

		<p>each job should be planned on its merits and have durations to suit the individual job.</p> <p>Highway Authorities are not utility experts and should not suggest ways of working</p>	<p>response above.</p> <p>The Authority reserves the right to refuse a permit or PAA based upon the duration of the proposed activities. For example, a proposed minor 3 day duration permit to complete a works phase such as 'Interim to Permanent Reinstatement' of a small trench in the carriageway of a Traffic Sensitive Street may not be acceptable when physical activities are unlikely to take 3 days.</p> <p>Technically a permit can be granted with 1 day duration, however, the Section 74 prescribed period must always be borne in mind.</p> <p>Another example, where proposed activities have a significant impact upon the network a Promoter may apply with a duration based upon experience, and justified via a comprehensive works description, this duration may still not be acceptable and conditions (such as extended working hours) may be a method to reduce overall duration, particularly where the traffic management/obstruction cannot be removed/moved during the course of the activities.</p> <p>The Authority will act reasonably in relation to durations and will base decisions on the information provided by the promoter. Discussions can also take place between the two parties. Furthermore, if matters cannot be resolved, the scheme has an arbitration process.</p>
CW	12.5.3	In the scenario above, would the authority suggest an alternative	Please refer to response 9.5 and 12.5.3 above

		method of working to complete the job more “speedily”? This ties in with why standard durations (as mentioned in 9.5) should not be encouraged because each job should be planned on its merits and have durations to suit the individual job.	
AW	12.5.3	Duration challenge should be challenged to a duration no shorter than the minimum allowed for minor works i.e. 3 days	Please refer to response 9.5 and 12.5.3 above
EDG	12.5.3	Bullet point c), which is about the equivalent of Section 56A, should not really be a bullet point under the heading “Timing and Duration”. It should really have a separate heading, such as “Location of works”.	Amended
Section 13: Permit Variations			
AJUG	13.6	This statement was taken from DfT guidance (Code of Practice for Permits 2008) that is no longer applicable and there is no regulation to support this addition to the permit scheme.	Noted however this original requirement continues to be an important co-ordination factor. Amended for clarification
CW	13.6	The above statement was taken from DfT guidance (Code of Practice for Permits 2008) that is no longer applicable and there is no regulation to support this addition to the permit scheme.	Please refer to response 13.6
Section 14: Revocation			
AJUG	14.2	There are certain circumstances that result a works promoter cancelling a planned activity reluctantly e.g. parked car over a stop tap or valve box. These are quite common occurrence in busy urban and/or residential areas. Where the works promoter has to cancel a planned activity due to a third party incident, it would be reasonable for the authority to waive the permit fee (if the works promoter could provide evidence).	Permit charges are applied in line with the fees calculated by the Permit matrix
CW	14.2	There are certain circumstances that result a works promoter cancelling a planned activity reluctantly e.g. parked car over a stop tap or valve box. These are quite common occurrence in busy urban and/or residential areas. Where the works promoter has to cancel a planned activity due to a third party incident, it would be reasonable for the authority to waive the permit fee (if the works promoter could	Please refer to response 14.2

		provide evidence).	
Section 15: Fees			
AJUG	15.4	What happens to revenue generated from permit fees if they exceed the allowable cost of the scheme?	Income is held over for future years and balanced over several years. If income consistently exceed costs then future fees will be reduced to achieve balance.
VM	15.4	What happens to revenue generated from permit fees if they exceed the allowable cost of the scheme?	Income is held over for future years and balanced over several years. If income consistently exceed costs then future fees will be reduced to achieve balance.
AJUG	15.4.1	Highway Authorities no longer have direct labour and pay Term Contractors to carryout work as do Works Promoters. Their Contractors aim to make a profit from the Highway Authority work and should therefore whilst not paying for Permits, have to meet penalties as other promoters. The current arrangements do not provide parity.	Penalties are recorded against all Promoters and will be detailed within KPIs.
AW	15.4.1	Highway Authorities no longer have direct labour and pay Term Contractors to carryout work as do Works Promoters. Their Contractors aim to make a profit from the Highway Authority work and should therefore whilst not paying for Permits, have to meet penalties as other promoters. The current arrangements do not provide parity.	Penalties are recorded against all Promoters and will be detailed within KPIs.
CW	15.6.1 (g)	There are certain circumstances where collaboration might not be at the same site location at the same time. For example, Cambridge Water could replace/repair apparatus before resurfacing take place (possibly under a road closure) or maybe Cambridge Water fit a new water service and then the gas come and fit a new gas service afterwards. If they use the same TM, this would be classed as collaboration but they wouldn't necessarily be working at the same time. Where Cambridgeshire want to promote joint working, they should encourage all forms of collaborative working and not be so prescriptive in their scheme document.	Your comments are welcomed. The Authority reserves the right to waive or reduce fees where collaboration can be shown to reduce the impact of activities in the Highway. Reduction in Highway impact is the key driver for discounts in this instance. The Authority would welcome dialogue with Undertakers in such circumstances
VM	15.7	Although concessions are welcomed, Virgin Media believe the administrative burden associated with the fee discounts and incentives will make the process impracticable.	Noted

AJUG	15.7.1	<p>Although concessions are welcomed, we believe the administrative burden associated with the fee discounts and incentives will make the process impracticable</p> <p>The 2015 Permit Regulations inserted 30 (3A) “A permit scheme shall include discounts for works which take place on streets subject to designation as traffic-sensitive, where the works take place wholly outside traffic-sensitive times.” Section 6.18 in the Statutory Guidance (Oct 2015) states “The minimum discount is 30 per cent for all qualifying permits. Authorities can give greater discounts if they wish to encourage particular behaviours”.</p> <p>In order to meet the principle permit scheme objective set out in 2.5.2 of the scheme “improve planning, scheduling and management of activities so that they do not cause unnecessary traffic disruption to any road user” the discount for working wholly outside traffic sensitive times should be far greater than 30% (maybe no fee at all). It has to be worthwhile to plan & schedule the shorter duration jobs specifically outside TS times otherwise promoters simply won’t make the extra effort.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>This is in line with the DfT Guidance.</p>
CW	15.7.1	<p>The 2015 Permit Regulations inserted 30 (3A) “A permit scheme shall include discounts for works which take place on streets subject to designation as traffic-sensitive, where the works take place wholly outside traffic-sensitive times.” Section 6.18 in the Statutory Guidance (Oct 2015) states “The minimum discount is 30 per cent for all qualifying permits. Authorities can give greater discounts if they wish to encourage particular behaviours”.</p> <p>In order to meet the principle permit scheme objective set out in 2.5.2 of the scheme “improve planning, scheduling and management of activities so that they do not cause unnecessary traffic disruption to any road user” the discount for working wholly outside traffic sensitive times should be far greater than 30% (maybe no fee at all). It has to be worthwhile to plan & schedule the shorter duration jobs specifically outside TS times otherwise promoters simply won’t make the extra effort.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>This is in line with the DfT Guidance.</p>
AJUG	15.8.2	<p>Whilst Anglian Water applauds the fees being reviewed after 3</p>	<p>Income is held over for future years and balanced over several years. If income consistently exceed costs then</p>

		years any surplus should be returned pro-rata to the promoters and not retained by the Authority. All income should be open to audit. Fees also need to be reviewed in line with any changes to the traffic sensitive network.	future fees will be reduced to achieve balance. This is in line with the DfT Guidance.
AW	15.8.2	Whilst Anglian Water applauds the fees being reviewed after 3 years any surplus should be returned pro-rata to the promoters and not retained by the Authority. All income should be open to audit. Fees also need to be reviewed in line with any changes to the traffic sensitive network.	Income is held over for future years and balanced over several years. If income consistently exceed costs then future fees will be reduced to achieve balance. This is in line with the DfT Guidance.
Section 16: Permit Conditions			
AJUG	16.2	How they will you manage 16.2 of the document on working times especially on 16.4.2 for faults and defined working hours.	Upon issue an Emergency or Urgent Works Permit Application, the promoter must be aware that activities should reflect information supplied on the application. EToN allows for the modification of Immediate works prior to a Permit being granted
UKPN	16.2	How will Cambridge manage 16.2 of the document on working times especially on 16.4.2 for faults and defined working hours.	Please refer to response 16.2 above
AJUG	16.2.1	The conditions are listed as A-H. It would provide more consistency if they were referenced to the National Standard Conditions as EToN ref 1-12 or provide further detail using the specific NCT codes.	A-H are types of conditions. NCT is the method to contextualise these conditions with appropriate wording and to allow for the transmission through the EToN Condition fields.
CW	16.2.1	The conditions are listed as A-H. It would provide more consistency if they were referenced to the National Standard Conditions as EToN ref 1-12 or provide further detail using the specific NCT codes.	Please refer to response 16.2.1 above
AW	16.2.1	This just needs to refer to national conditions and doesn't need the current words.	Please refer to response 16.2.1 above
AJUG	16.3.5	Wording – “should” be changed to “may” this takes in to account it is the Authorities responsibility to impose any conditions not the Promoter however, the Promoter may include multiple conditions on their application.	Thankyou for this response. The word ‘should’ is relevant and will remain

AW	16.3.5	Wording – “should” be changed to “may” this takes in to account it is the Authorities responsibility to impose any conditions not the Promoter however, the Promoter may include multiple conditions on their application.	Please refer to response 16.3.5. above
UKPN	16.4.3	Phoning before a fault job is started is there a 24 hour number and will it be on Eton and how will it affect our 12 hour commitment as we cannot always wait for a phone agreement especially on safety issues	Please refer to response 11.9.2
AJUG	16.4.3	As 11.9.2 above Has there been a review of the streets that would require early notification? Or does this section apply to all Strategically Sensitive Streets? Please can you send out the contact telephone number (both during working hours and out of hours) prior to the scheme going live to ensure utilities can put procedures/processes in place to deal with this requirement.	Please refer to response 11.9.2
CW	16.4.3	Has there been a review of the streets that would require early notification? Or does this section apply to all Strategically Sensitive Streets? Please can you send out the contact telephone number (both during working hours and out of hours) prior to the scheme going live to ensure Cambridge Water can put procedures/processes in place to deal with this requirement.	Please refer to response 11.9.2
AW	16.4.3	As 11.9.2 above	Please refer to response 11.9.2
AJUG	16.4.4	If work has ceased there is no value in applying for a retrospective TTRO. It would not be valid. However, if the Authority has been contacted for authority prior to the works taking place then the application would be valid and required. Any works taking place out of hours requiring a Closure will require prior authorisation by the Police (Police Emergency Powers).	Noted, existing arrangements would still apply to Closures. We would not issue a TTRO if closed by the Police.
AW	16.4.4	If work has ceased there is no value in applying for a retrospective TTRO. It would not be valid. However, if the Authority has been contacted for authority prior to the works taking place then the application would be valid and required. Any works taking place out of hours requiring a Closure will require prior authorisation by the Police (Police Emergency Powers).	Please refer to response to 16.4.4

UKPN	16.4.5	A list of any conditions for immediate activities will be detailed on the Cambridgeshire County Council website if required. These conditions are likely to change in line with any new Permit regulations, Statutory Guidance or HAUC Permit Advice notes. Not sure that any DfT legislation or guidance suggests the use of conditions specific to immediate activities? What would these be?	Noted, however provision will remain in the scheme document based upon the possibility of amendments to current guidance
AJUG	16.4.5	The Statutory Guidance – Permit Scheme Conditions (March 2015) sets out the National Standard Conditions that apply to all permits.	Please refer to response 16.4.5
CW	16.4.5	The Statutory Guidance – Permit Scheme Conditions (March 2015) sets out the National Standard Conditions that apply to all permits.	Please refer to response 16.4.5
AJUG	16.5.1	The use of the word “model” refers to the old “model conditions” that were applied to permit schemes. Suggest change of wording to “standard condition text” or “template” to avoid any confusion.	Thankyou. 16.5.1. to 16.5.3 amended to clarify
CW	16.5.1	The use of the word “model” refers to the old “model conditions” that were applied to permit schemes. Suggest change of wording to “standard condition text” or “template” to avoid any confusion.	Thankyou. 16.5.1. to 16.5.3 amended to clarify
EDG	16.5.3	Zero missing in first reference to NCT04A	Amended
AJUG	16.10.4	Is this still required if TM is changed to one of lesser impact	Every Permit is different and such a condition may be required if the TM is changed to a lesser impact to make the Authority aware of decreased impact on the Network. There may be multiple changes of TM on one Permit. For example the activities may commence with Multi-way PLS on day 1-5, then have 10 days of give and take, moving back to PLS on day 16. Therefore, each change may require contact. Whilst the Undertaker may be working towards this schedule, engineering reasons may change this schedule, therefore such information is vital to allow effective co-ordination. It does not necessarily always require a Variation Application, just contact and an update. Each circumstance is different and Permits will only require such a condition where it is reasonable to expect it.

AW	16.10.4	Is this still required if TM is changed to one of lesser impact	Please refer to response to 16.10.4
AJUG	16.11.1	An Authority Imposed Variation to change the methodology must be reasonable. The best assessment of the methodology required will come from the works promoter who understand the work and the H&S requirements	Noted
CW	16.11.1	An Authority Imposed Variation to change the methodology must be reasonable. The best assessment of the methodology required will come from the works promoter.	Noted
AJUG	16.11.2	The works promoter should not have to justify every decision to use open-cut method of working. There are many occasions where minimum dig isn't appropriate especially on short duration R&M activities.	This is an operational requirement to support good communication and the smooth running of the Permit Scheme.
CW	16.13.2	Please can you send out the contact telephone number both during working hours and out of hours incl. a weekend prior to the scheme going live to ensure Cambridge Water can put procedures/processes in place to deal with this requirement. This section only mentions restrictions during Monday – Saturday. What are the environmentally sensitive hours on a Sunday?	Yes, information will be supplied. Activities and their impact on the environment will differ from location to location. Whereas activities may be possible on a Sunday morning, the environmental impact may be considered around location and the noise associated with such activities. For example, there may be a case where carrying out activities not requiring breaking out of the road surface may be possible out of normal working hours. Each permit will be assessed on its own merits and conditions attached accordingly.
AJUG	16.13.2	Please can you send out the contact telephone number both during working hours and out of hours incl. a weekend prior to the scheme going live to ensure utilities can put procedures/processes in place to deal with this requirement. This section only mentions restrictions during Monday – Saturday. What are the environmentally sensitive hours on a Sunday?	Please refer to response 16.13.2 above
AJUG	16.13.4	See 9.2.3 of the CoP which states “Where it has directed works to be carried out at night, it is the street authority’s responsibility to reach agreement with Environmental Health Officers on any resultant noise issues.”	16.13.4 text is correct

AW	16.13.4	See 9.2.3 of the CoP which states “Where it has directed works to be carried out at night, it is the street authority’s responsibility to reach agreement with Environmental Health Officers on any resultant noise issues.”	Please refer to 16.13.4 response above
Section 17: Inspections			
Section 18: Sanctions			
AJUG	18.5.3	Regulation 20 carries a maximum fine of level 4 on the standard scale.	Amended thankyou
CW	18.5.3	Regulation 20 carries a maximum fine of level 4 on the standard scale.	Amended thankyou
EDG	18.5.3	Regulation 20 carries a maximum fine of level 4 on the standard scale.	Amended thankyou
Section 19: Dispute Resolution			
CW	19.5.1	For complex issues, it would be best to consult HAUC (England). HAUC (UK) are to set up to design policy and strategy not discuss disputes unless they are a national problem.	Thankyou, scheme amended
Section 20: Related Matters and Procedures			
AJUG	20.2.1	Only Sections 14-15 RTRA 1984 apply to works (Sec 16 relates to Events held on the Highway).	Amended, thank you.
AW	20.2.1	Only Sections 14-15 RTRA 1984 apply to works (Sec 16 relates to Events held on the Highway).	Amended, thank you.
AJUG	20.2.1 A	A Notice only relates to 5 days an Emergency Order relates to 21 days	Noted.
AW	20.2.1 A	A Notice only relates to 5 days an Emergency Order relates to 21 days	Noted.
AJUG	20.2.4	The Police Powers can only come in to effect to deal with a spontaneous incident or Emergency they can however, last for up to 7 days.	Amended, thank you.

AW	20.2.4	The Police Powers can only come in to effect to deal with a spontaneous incident or Emergency they can however, last for up to 7 days.	Amended, thank you.
AJUG	20.4.1	Whilst a Major Permit requires 3 months notice to be given to the Authority there is requirement in law that requires the Promoter to apply 3 months in advance. It is accepted that this is desired by the Authority however, they only have to advertise the Order 2 weeks prior to the Order coming into effect i.e. 2 weeks for the intends and 7 days for the has made. 3 Months is excessive when they are given notice through the PAA.	Noted. CCC as an authority reserves the right to require the 3 Months notice but is committed to working closely with promoters to explore areas where timescales can be flexible.
AW	20.4.1	Whilst a Major Permit requires 3 months notice to be given to the Authority there is requirement in law that requires the Promoter to apply 3 months in advance. It is accepted that this is desired by the Authority however, they only have to advertise the Order 2 weeks prior to the Order coming into effect i.e. 2 weeks for the intends and 7 days for the has made. 3 Months is excessive when they are given notice through the PAA.	Noted. CCC as an authority reserves the right to require the 3 Months notice but is committed to working closely with promoters to explore areas where timescales can be flexible.
AJUG	20.7.1	Where the Authority consider apparatus to be dangerous and requires an immediate response, they should therefore either remain to protect road users from the perceived danger or make it safe	Noted
EDG	20.7	“Dangerous Occurrence or Defects” Should this heading be “Dangerous and Non-Dangerous Occurrence or Defects, as the detail in the section covers both.	Thankyou Amended
AW	20.7.1	Where the Authority consider apparatus to be dangerous and requires an immediate response, they should therefore either remain to protect road users from the perceived danger or make it safe	Noted
AW	20.8.1	Should include comply with the Code of Practice for Safety at Street Works (Red Book)	Noted 20.8.1 text is correct
AJUG	20.8.1	Should include comply with the Code of Practice for Safety at Street Works (Red Book)	Please refer to response 20.8.1
AJUG	20.13.2	Should include the provision for Temporary Traffic Management to be	Each circumstance will be different, however where

		<p>placed out in advance of the works to prevent parking and facilitate them.</p> <p>Under which National Standard Condition would this be applicable?</p>	<p>registerable these should be included in the permit start and end dates. Potentially a Consultation condition may be used in exceptional circumstances, or a condition pre-agreed between all parties (EtoN condition type 13 – Other). Based upon the HAUC guidance below.</p> <p>There may be a specific circumstance where an additional condition needs to be added to a permit that is not covered by the wording above.</p> <p>Any such condition must;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. first be agreed with the work promoter (in line with the respective duties imposed by s59 and s60 of the 1991 Act); 2. be specific to both the circumstances of the particular activity and the locality; 3. fall within regulation 10 (2) (a – h); 4. follow the DfT statutory guidance; and 5. adhere to the guidance set out in paragraph 5 of this guidance document [DfT text]
CW	20.13.2	Under which National Standard Condition would this be applicable?	Please refer to response 20.13.2
AW	20.13.2	Should include the provision for Temporary Traffic Management to be placed out in advance of the works to prevent parking and facilitate them.	Please refer to response 20.13.2
CW	20.17.1	This is a great tool to assess the impact on traffic however the traffic flow information required to complete the formula is not readily available on the NSG and we would have to contact the Highway Authority every time. It would be really helpful to have the traffic flow on the NSG/ASD or on the council website or in a spreadsheet.	If a Disruption Effect Score is required the Authority will work with the Promoter to ensure they have the necessary data.
EDG	24.4.7	This states the accounts for permit charges will include “District - the Statutory Undertaker Operational District (OD Number)” – this implies that you will produce a separate invoice for each Undertaker OD. Do you really want to do this, bearing in mind that some undertakers	Amended for clarification

	<p>have dozens (or even hundreds) of ODs. I would recommend producing one invoice per organisation, albeit the details lines of the permits would contain the OD Prefix so Undertakers could sub-divide it if they wish.</p>	
<p>Section 21: Changes and Ceasing to Operate</p>		
<p>Section 22: Street Works Registers and National Street Gazetteer NSG</p>		
<p>Section 23: Transitional Arrangements</p>		
<p>Section 24: Payment of Permit Fees</p>		
<p>APPENDIX A – Glossary</p>		
<p>EDG Appendix A –</p> <p>Statutory Guidance – “Means the Traffic Management Act 2004 Statutory Guidance for Permits (March 2008).” This is no longer valid and should be updated to relate to the 2015 Statutory Guidance.</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>THE REGULATIONS THIS IS DEFINED AS THE 2007 REGULATIONS; SHOULD IT IDEALLY STATE “AS AMENDED BY The Traffic Management Permit Scheme (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015”</p> <p>Amended</p>		
<p>APPENDIX B - Dis-applied Sections from the NRSWA (1991)</p>		
<p>APPENDIX C - Modifications to NRSWA (1991)</p>		

APPENDIX D - Application & Responses Times			
APPENDIX E – Disruption Effect Score			
APPENDIX F – Permit Fees			
AJUG		<p>AJUG acknowledge that Cambridgeshire County Council will be applying a 30% discount for working wholly outside traffic-sensitive times, but request that works on category 3 and 4 roads are granted by default and for those permits to be at zero fee levels.</p> <p>The majority of utility major works are classed as major as they need a TTRO for what would be minor works, your fee structure means this would be charged at the highest rate instead of the lowest for major works. Why does the requirement of needing a TTRO increase the cost as we pay a separate, substantial fee for the administration of TTRO's.</p>	<p>Comment noted but rejected.</p> <p>Coordination is undertaken on Cat 3-4 roads and therefore costs are incurred which are recovered through the fees charged.</p>
CW		<p>Maximum fees have been applied to all road types and all categories of works. The cost benefit analysis study used to determine the permit fee structure used guidance such as Traffic Management Act 2004, Permit Schemes, Decision-making and development (2nd Edition), November 2010 and Traffic Management Act 2004, Code of Practice for Permits, March 2006 which have been replaced by the Statutory Guidance for Permit Schemes (October 2015).</p> <p>Could you please clarify whether Cambridgeshire County Council approve Temporary Traffic Notices to cover short duration planned works i.e. road closure for up to 5 days? Or are TTRN's used for emergency situations only?</p>	<p>CCC does not use TTRNs. In emergency situations we use Emergency TTROs</p>
CW		<p>There are no (*) marked on the fee table in Appendix F so it is unclear where/when the discount applies.</p> <p>During the presentation, one of the slides stated that no fee would be charged for works where there is no traffic management on traffic sensitive streets during traffic sensitive times. The scheme document states that works have to be “wholly outside of traffic sensitive times”. You have to make sure your scheme document states exactly what discounts will be applied to scenarios because it is a legal document.</p>	<p>Thankyou amendment be made</p> <p>Discounts will be applied to works that are Wholly outside of Traffic Sensitive Times on Traffic Sensitive Streets. Will apply a discount to both Road Categories 3 – 4 that is Traffic Sensitive and Road Category 0-2, where the works are</p>

			Wholly outside Traffic Sensitive Times.
VM		Virgin Media acknowledge that Cambridgeshire County Council will be applying a 30% discount for working wholly outside traffic-sensitive times, but request that works on category 3 and 4 roads are granted by default and for those permits to be at zero fee levels.	<p>Comment noted but rejected.</p> <p>Coordination is undertaken on Cat 3-4 roads and therefore costs are incurred which are recovered through the fees charged.</p>

END OF DOCUMENT