

Report for: ACTION



Contains Confidential or Exempt Information	No
Title	Road and Streetworks Permit Scheme
Responsible Officer(s)	Simon Fletcher, Strategic Director of Operations, 01628 796484
Contact officer, job title and phone number	Ben Smith, Head of Highways & Transport, 01628 796147
Member reporting	Cllr Bicknell, Lead Member for Highways & Transport
For Consideration By	Cabinet
Date to be Considered	29 September 2016
Implementation Date if Not Called In	28 November 2016
Affected Wards	All
Key Words	Streetworks; permit; roads; utility companies

REPORT SUMMARY

This report is designed to give the Council more powers to manage utilities damaging and disrupting our highway network.

Residents will benefit from less disruption as roadworks should be completed on time, faster and at the least disruptive times of day with high quality first time permanent reinstatements.

1. Cabinet received a report on 31st March 2016 and resolved to approve in principle the development of a Streetworks Permit scheme; undertake consultation and report the outcome to Cabinet in September 2016.
2. This report provides an update on the introduction of a Road and Streetworks Permit Scheme which supports the manifesto commitment '*...Work with utility companies to improve the quality of road and pavement repairs...*' and highlights the outcome of the consultation.
3. The report seeks approval to 'Go Live' with the permit scheme by the 28 November 2016 delivering an improved service for residents.
4. The financial implications of this report are:
 - Capital investment of £120k for scheme development; consultation and implementation costs
 - development and implementation costs are recoverable through permit fees

to be charged following implementation

- the net position of annual operating costs and income deliver a positive position

If recommendations are adopted, how will residents benefit?	
Benefits to residents and reasons why they will benefit.	Dates by which they can expect to notice a difference.
Residents will benefit from improved journey times, reduced congestion, more stakeholder consultation, improved information and improved condition of the road infrastructure.	28 November 2016.

1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDED: That Cabinet:

- (i) Notes the outcome of the consultation**
- (ii) Approves commencement of the Roads and Streetworks Permit scheme**

2. REASON FOR DECISION AND OPTIONS CONSIDERED

2.1 Cabinet considered a report on 31st March 2016 and resolved to:

i) Approve in principle the development of a Roads and Streetworks Permit scheme and endorse the approach being taken.

ii) Approve commencement of the consultation process with utility companies and other stakeholders.

iii) Approve a budget of £120,000 to be met from the Development Fund in 2016/17 for scheme development; consultation and implementation.

iv) Receive a report in September 2016 to consider the outcome of the consultation.

2.2 The formal consultation ran for a period of eight weeks beginning on the 17th June 2016 with a deadline for responses no later than 12th August 2016.

The draft Scheme Document and accompanying covering letter was issued to 125 key stakeholder organisations, including local neighbouring Highway Authorities, Utilities, road user representative groups, suppliers and non-government organisations.

A total of 176 individual comments were received by the deadline.

2.3 Each response has been reviewed and responded to in the consultation report which is published on the Royal Boroughs website as Appendix A. The consultation feedback is helpful and ensures that the scheme has been rigorously reviewed in line with best practice.

There are no fundamental issues arising from the consultation. Therefore, it is recommended that the permit scheme be implemented by 28 November 2016.

- 2.4 In parallel with the consultation a full business case / cost-benefit analysis has been prepared.

A summary is attached as Appendix B and the full business case is available on the Royal Borough's website as Appendix C (Part II).

In summary, the permit scheme offers a societal benefit to cost ratio of 25.58:1.

- 2.5 The permit scheme will give the Council more powers to manage utilities. Residents will benefit from less disruption as roadworks should be completed more quickly; at the least disruptive times with high quality first time permanent reinstatements.

- 2.6 In light of the resident benefits and the following key factors, it is recommended that the permit scheme be introduced by 28 November 2016:

- * Cabinet approved the principle of the permit scheme on 31st March 2016
- * the consultation has not identified any major issues
- * the scheme delivers a very positive benefit to cost ratio

Options

Option	Comments
(a) implement a road and streetworks permit scheme by 28 November 2016	(a) This option is recommended . A permit scheme would increase the Council's ability to coordinate and control activities on the highway therefore minimising the congestion and improving the condition of road infrastructure and give us more powers to fine utility companies that break the rules
(b) continue the existing approach based on a notice system under the New Roads and Streetworks Act	(b) This option is not recommended. The current situation would remain and opportunities to improve control and co-ordination of works benefitting residents, business and visitors would not be realised
(c) Create a shared service to deliver a permit scheme.	(c) This option is not recommended at this time It is recommended that this option be explored post-implementation to further enhance the business case and align with the Royal Boroughs Delivering Differently programme
(d) Outsource or create a Royal Borough trading company to deliver a managed service.	(d) This option is not recommended at this time It is recommended that this option be explored post-implementation to further enhance the business case and align with the Royal Boroughs Delivering Differently programme

3. KEY IMPLICATIONS

Defined Outcomes	Unmet	Met	Exceeded	Significantly Exceeded	Date they should be deliver by
Implement Road and Streetworks Permit scheme by:	Not achieved	30 November 2016	14 November 2016	1 November 2016	30 November 2016
Over-running road works reduced*	< 5%	5-10%	11-20%	> 20%	30 November 2017
Complaints relating to the quality of utility company repairs reduced*	< 5%	5-10%	11-20%	> 20%	30 November 2017

* BASELINE TO BE ESTABLISHED

4. FINANCIAL DETAILS

4.1 Revenue Funding

	2016/17*	2017/18	2018/19
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Addition**	153*	460	454
Income**	156*	468	467

*Figures for 2016/17 as based on a part year effect, commencing 1st December 2016

**these figures relate wholly to the operation of the permit scheme not approved budgets

4.2 Capital Funding

	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
	Capital £'000	Capital £'000	Capital £'000
Addition	£0	£0	£0
Reduction	£0	£0	£0

4.3 On 31st March 2016, Cabinet approved funding of £120k from the development fund for scheme development; consultation and implementation.

£105k costs have been committed to date for the following elements:

- Consultancy support (developing business case; document preparation; analysis and response to consultation) £50k
- ICT System (upgrade and new module for CONFIRM system) £40k
- Staff training (permit scheme requirements and new ICT system) £20k
- Recruitment £5k

It is projected that the scheme will be delivered within the approved budget.

4.4 Summary business case (Appendix B) identifies:

- Year 1 Operating Expenditure £459,956
(based on Employee costs of £278,358 (3.57 FTE's) and operational costs of £181,898 (for example ICT systems))
- Year 1 Revenue £468,096

This highlights an over recovery of £8,140 in year 1

5. LEGAL

Part 3 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA) and associated regulations (2007) as amended allow a highway authority to introduce a permit scheme to deliver their duty to co-ordinate works of all kinds on the highway including temporary occupation and use of the highway by all Promoters e.g. utility companies.

6. VALUE FOR MONEY

Efficient movement on the Boroughs road network is essential for creating a successful local economy. As the scheme is projected to be cost neutral it optimises value for money by delivering financial and non financial benefits to residents, businesses and visitors to the Borough.

7. SUSTAINABILITY IMPACT APPRAISAL

A permit scheme will reduce the levels of congestion and will support and promote sustainable transport and integrate with air quality policies.

8. RISK MANAGEMENT

Risk	Uncontrolled Risk	Controls	Controlled Risk
Financial projections embedded in the full business case with respect to income / expenditure are not achieved	High	Use of specialist consultants and sufficient internal scrutiny arrangements in place via use of corporate project management tools.	Low
Failure to comply with the legislative requirements delays or prohibits scheme implementation, thereby benefits not realised	Medium	Use of specialist consultants and sufficient internal scrutiny arrangements in place via use of corporate project management tools.	Low

Utility companies will be required to comply with the scheme may challenge the validity of the scheme if it has not been extensively assessed and shown to be compliant.	High	Statutory consultation with stakeholders - complete	Low
System requirements not in place to enable delivery of permit scheme	High	Project team established with specialist ICT resource	Low

9. LINKS TO STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

The council's corporate strategy seeks to improve the environment, economy and transport within its focus on putting residents first.

Successfully delivering highway schemes and improving resident satisfaction in our road network are key ambitions within the strategy and the new permit scheme will better co-ordinate works, reduce levels of congestion and ensure that quality of the repairs are satisfactory supporting the council to deliver against these ambitions for residents.

Improved control over when, where and how road works are undertaken by utilities companies enables the council to better consider the implications for residents on non-urgent works, further supporting the council's strategic ambition to deliver improved customer services and outcomes for residents through the use of existing and emerging technology.

10. EQUALITIES, HUMAN RIGHTS AND COMMUNITY COHESION

An improved highway network benefits all road users.

11. STAFFING/WORKFORCE AND ACCOMMODATION IMPLICATIONS:

Operation of the Roadworks & Streetworks Permit scheme is projected to require 3.57 FTE's consisting of Street Works Officers; Street Works Co-ordinators and Traffic Managers.

Implementation in November 2016 is projected to be resourced primarily from existing staff. However, recruitment of an additional streetworks officer on a fixed term contract until 31st March 2016 will be required to ensure that the Royal Borough delivers the legal obligations required to operate the permit scheme.

During the period between 28th November 2016 and 31st March 2017 resource levels will be reviewed and evaluated to ensure that they align with the outcomes of the Delivering Differently programme in Highways.

12. PROPERTY AND ASSETS

The approach set out within this report seeks to improve the Highway Network and maintain the highway asset in accordance with good practice.

13. ANY OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

N/A

14. CONSULTATION

The report will be considered at the Highways, Transport & Environment Overview & Scrutiny Panel meeting on 19 September 2016 with comments reported to Cabinet for consideration.

15. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Jan 2015 (Complete)	Permit Scheme Project commencement including engaging services of specialist consultants.
Jan to March 2016 (Complete))	Develop draft scheme for consultation
Jan to June 2016 (Complete))	Business case
24 March 2016 (Complete)	Cabinet report
April to May 2016 (Complete)	Engagement with Statutory Undertakers and other interested parties
June to August 2016 (Complete)	Commence formal consultation (8 week duration)
August 2016 (Complete)	Review consultee comments and prepare report including any modifications to permit scheme documents
September 2016	Cabinet report
October 2016	Formal notification to consultees that permit order has been issued (Subject to Cabinet approval)
28 November 2016	Permit scheme goes live

16. APPENDICES

Appendix A – Consultation Report (available electronically)

Appendix B – Cost Benefit Analysis: Summary

17. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

17.1 The primary objective of the permit scheme is to improve the strategic and operational management of the highway network through better planning, scheduling and management of activities (roads and streetworks) to minimise disruption to any road user and to improve the quality of repairs undertaken by utility companies, including first time permanent reinstatements.

17.2 Key scheme objectives and benefits:

- reduced disruption on the road network
- improvements to overall network management
- reduction in delays to the travelling public
- reduction in costs to businesses caused by delays
- creating a safer environment
- reduced carbon emissions

- focus on first time permanent reinstatements
- coordinate utility works on our highway network

17.3 Scheme objectives will be delivered by improving performance in the following areas:

- enhanced coordination and cooperation
- encouragement of partnership working between the Royal Borough, scheme promoters and key stakeholders.
- provision of more accurate and timely information to be communicated between all stakeholders including residents, visitors and businesses
- promotion and encouragement of collaborative working
- improvement in timing and duration of activities particularly in relation to the busiest streets within the network
- promotion of dialogue with regard to the way activities are to be carried out
- enhanced programming of activities and better forward planning by all works promoters
- give us more powers to fine utility companies that break the rules

Additionally, financial penalties may be imposed for works promoters who do not complete works on time; for working without a permit or who breach the conditions of a permit (for example: working at peak times on main routes).

17.4 With respect to improving the road and pavement reinstatements, the current system allows works promoters to undertake a temporary reinstatement and to return within a maximum period of 2 years to undertake a permanent and high quality reinstatement. The proposed permit scheme will focus on encouraging utilities to undertake first time permanent reinstatements.

17.5 A series of statements for information are set out below:

- A permit scheme allows the Council, as a Permit Authority, to charge Statutory Undertakers (utility companies) a fee for processing a permit application or permit-variation
- A permit scheme cannot be used to generate surplus income but will be self-funding, including the recovery of reasonable overheads Maximum charges are set by statute (charges are set out in Appendix C)
- It is anticipated that RBWM would process approximately 7,000 utility permits each year

18. Consultation (Mandatory)

Name of consultee	Post held and Department	Date sent	Date received	See comments in paragraph:
Internal				
Cllr Bicknell	Lead Member for Highways & Transport	31/08/16	01/09/16	Minor amends and clarification of start-up costs
Simon Fletcher	Strategic Director of Operations	28/08/16	30/08/16	Detailed business case moved to Part II due to the inclusion of

				personal information
Mark Lampard	Finance Partner	28/08/16	01/09/16	Section (4) Finance and Appendix B amended
Tony Robinson	Streetcare – Team Leader	28/08/16	31/08/16	Financial detail updated
Sarika Varma	Project Manager	28/08/16	31/08/16	Minor amends to text / report reviewed by external consultants supporting scheme development - approved
Michelle Dear	HR Partner	28/08/16		
Anna Trott	Strategy & Performance Manager	31/08/16	01/09/16	Section (9) updated

REPORT HISTORY

Decision type:	Urgency item?	
For information	No	
Report author	Job title	Full contact no:
Ben Smith	Head of Highways & Transport	01628 796147

Appendix A

Title: **RBWM Consultation Report**
Project: Proposed Permit Scheme
Date: 17th August 2016
Author: Jason Setford-Smith, Consultant

1 Introduction

The formal consultation regarding the proposed Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Permit Scheme ('RBWMPS') ran for a period of eight (8) weeks beginning on the 17th June 2016. The deadline for receipt of responses was no later than 5pm on 12th August 2016.

It was stated in the consultation covering letter that 'all responses received by the 12th August 2016 will be taken into consideration and, if the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead 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 125 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 175.

A total of 176 individual comments on the proposed Permit Scheme were received by the deadline.

Additional comments from EToN (IT system group) 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.

List of Consultees who responded by the deadline

- 1) National Grid (NG)
- 2) Royal Berkshire Fire & Rescue Service (RBFRS)
- 3) Virgin Media (VM)
- 4) Scottish & Southern (SS)
- 5) Openreach (Or)
- 6) Thames Water (TW)
- 7) RBWM Legal (RBWM L)
- 8) Consultants (Co)

9) EToN (ET)

No Consultees responded after the deadline.

Consultees Category or Group
Bus Operators
Central Government
Emergency Services
IT and Systems Suppliers
Passenger Transport
Representative and Interest Groups
Surrounding Local Authorities
Utility Companies

This list is a guide to help you in identifying stakeholder groups. You may have a more suitable contact email than the ones I have provided.

Internal Contacts	
Head Of Legal	Councillor Alexander
Head of Environmental Health	Councillor Quick
Director Of Planning, Development & Regeneration	Councillor Hill
Civil Contingencies Manager (runs SAG)	Simon Fletcher
Transport Committee Chair	Ben Smith
Transport Committee Deputy Chair	Vikki Roberts
Transport Committee Opposition	Trees
Councillor Bicknell	Grounds Maintenance
Councillor Bowden	Customer Services
Maidenhead Town Centre Manager	Leisure Services
Windsor Town Centre Manager	

Bus Operators	
Abba Cars and Minibuses	Lianne Coaches
Arriva the Shires	Windsor Duck Tours
Courtney Buses	SLK Services
White Bus Services	Reading & Wokingham Coaches
First	People2Places
Bear Buses	Carousel Buses
Dickson Travel	City Sightseeing Windsor
Redline Buses	Fernhill Travel

Central Government	
Department for Transport	Highways England

Geoplace	Environmental Agency
----------	----------------------

Emergency Services

Fire & Rescue Services	Transport Police
Thames Valley Police	Frimley Health Trust
Ambulance Service	Berkshire Health Trust

IT and Systems Suppliers

Confirm	
---------	--

Passenger Transport

Network Rail	Great Western Railway
Passenger Focus	South West Trains

Representative and Interest Groups

Automobile Association	Bellstan
British Motorcyclists Federation	Amey
British Cycling	Thame Velo
Freight Transport Association	Radian
Guide Dogs Association for the Blind	Maidenhead Housing Solutions
Road Haulage Association	Maidenhead & District Cycling
Royal Automobile Club	Cyclists Touring Club
Royal Association for Deaf People	Mouchel
Royal Blind Society	Veolia
Crown Estates	ISS Waterers

Surrounding Local Authorities

Reading Borough Council	Datchet
Slough Borough Council	Eton Town Council
Wokingham Borough Council	Horton
Bucks County Council	Hurley
West Berkshire Council	Old Windsor
Surrey Council	Shottesbrooke
Bracknell Forest Borough Council	Sunningdale
Oxfordshire County Council	Sunninghill & Ascot
Bisham Parish	Waltham St Lawrence
Bray Parish	White Waltham
Cookham Parish	Wraysbury
Cox Green	

Utility Companies

National Joint Utilities Group	Energetics Electricity Limited
BT Openreach	ES Pipelines Limited
Scottish & Southern Energy	Eunetworks Fiber UK Ltd
National Grid Gas	Fulcrum Pipelines Ltd
South East Water	Gas Transportation Co Ltd
Thames Water	Harlaxton Energy Networks
Virgin Media	Hibernia Atlantic UK Ltd
Affinity Water	Level Three Communications
Abovenet Communications UK Ltd	Mainline Pipelines
Gigaclear PLC	02
Infocus Public Networks	Southern Gas Networks
Orange PCS Group	TeliaSonera International Carrier UK Ltd
Romec	Vodafone
Instalcom	City Fibre
Concept Solutions People Ltd	

S50 Contacts

Note: The Section 50 applicants over the last 12 months.

AWH Utility Services Limited	Radian Group Limited
Royal Household	James Mathias
Craig Sidley	Argon Utility Services
Europoll Supply Limited	Grove Construction Ltd
John Henry Group	Shanly Homes
Amy Skellum	J Browne Construction Co Ltd
Beard Construction	STD Civils Limited
CMU Infrastructure Limited	Buxted Construction
ASL Limited	Call Flow Solutions Limited
GD Contracting	Saleem Ahmed
Combined Services DW Ltd	Ashvale Civil Engineering

General Comments

Org	Suggested amendment / clarification / comment / question	Response / action / recommendation
VM	<p>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.</p>	<p>The scheme does focus on strategically significant streets.</p> <p>Charges for Cat 0-2 TSS streets are higher than for Cat 3-4 non TSS streets.</p>
NG	<p>Costs Could you please provide a breakdown of how the Total Capital Expenditure Costs are derived Could you please provide a breakdown of how the Year 1 Operating Expenditure is derived Could you please provide a breakdown of how the Operating Expenditure (After Year 1) Costs are calculated Could you please provide a breakdown of how the Year 1 Revenue Expenditure has been calculated Could you please provide a breakdown of how the Annual Revenue Expenditure (After Year 1) is derived Could you please provide details of costs associated with running the current Noticing Scheme for 2015-16 together with the number of F.T.E's involved</p> <p>Business Case Has the cost of managing HA works been included in the expenditure figures?</p>	<p>Details of the costs and breakdowns are contained within the Cost Benefit Analysis which will be published.</p> <p>The cost of processing Permits Highway Authority works has been included in the costs of the scheme. These costs are met by the Authority</p>

	Do the revenue figures include income from HA works?	and not from Utility Fees.
NG	<p>Legislative Guidance</p> <p>Where has the Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA), Code of Practice for Permits, March 2006 been used for guidance as this is now superseded by the Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes October 2015?</p>	Noted.
NG	<p>Summary of Appraisal</p> <p>Bullet point 2 – Annual delay cost for Utility works – Does this figure include HA works? If not have these been identified separately?</p>	<p>NO. The annual delay cost is for Utility works.</p> <p>No, this has not been identified separately.</p>
RBFRS	<p>Firstly, I would clarify that all works carried out by the Brigades Hydrant Inspectors are exempt from Permits to Work as they are classed as temporary works. Their duties are to lift up lids and test F/H's & occasionally clean pits out. They are normally at a F/H for less than 10 minutes sometimes less than 5 minutes.</p>	<p>This is correct. These specific works do not require a Permit.</p>
RBFRS	<p>Secondly, we would request that all Fire Hydrant repairs that South East Water or Thames Water (RBWM is generally covered by SEW) do on behalf of RBFRS are also exempt from permits. Any permit fees/costs incurred by a Water Co whilst carrying out works on our behalf are passed onto the Brigades. This increases our costs and in turn results in the Brigades asking the local Councils for more money, something we can avoid if this costs is made exempt. So far of those in Berkshire who have introduced the permit scheme F/H is exempt and we are more than happy to advise of where works are taking place or if this is not the case happy to assist in spot checks you may wish to do.</p> <p>I do understand however that and road closures do have a much higher price and something that is rarely required for a F/H. However if this was the case we understand that we would be required to meet these costs.</p>	<p>These works do require a Permit so they can be co-ordinated along with all other works. However, if the work is on behalf of the Brigades no Permit fee will be required.</p> <p>Thank you. This is agreed.</p>

Scheme Document comments

Org	Document Section	Suggested amendment / clarification / comment / question	Response / reply / recommendation
Section 1 & 2: Foreword and Introduction			
SS	1.1.1	I understood this was a scheme mirrored already in place in Southampton and Brighton	Correct.
Co	2.3.1	The regulations are amended and require the reference updating.	Correct. An edit will be made.
TW	2.3.1	The reference to regulations should be the amendment regulations. Paragraph should refer to the DFT Oct 2015 Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes & 2007 regulations now amended Traffic Management Permit Scheme (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015	Correct. An edit will be made regarding the amended regulations.
Or	2.3.1	as amended	Noted.
SS	2.3.1	· , 2007 regulations now amended Traffic Management Permit Scheme (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 (S.I. 2015/958)	Correct. An edit will be made regarding the amended regulations.
TW	2.3.3	Reference made to Code of Practice for Permits 2008 must be removed, This document is not in use since the statutory guidance was released in October 2015	Correct. An edit will be made.
Or	2.3.3	code of Practice has been withdrawn and is no longer valid	Noted.
VM	2.3.5	Virgin Media acknowledges that RBWM recognises the roll out of Superfast Broadband.	Noted.
SS	2.5.1	Not sure how scheme will cover more than street works?	This has always been the case, hence the use of the term Activities.
TW	2.5.1/2	If there are subsequent regulations introduced that RBW&M wish to incorporate into the scheme a variation would need to be prepared - do not believe that the mention of possible	Correct. An edit will be made.

		future changes should form the body of the scheme	
TW	2.5.2	As 2.5.2 specifies the use of the word activities instead of works, this paragraph should reflect that and change the word 'Works' to activities for consistency. The rest of the document needs to reflect 2.5.2 to ensure consistency as several paragraphs still mention works when the context indicates it should read activities.	Correct. An edit will be made.
TW	2.5.2	The correct reference should be quoted when referring to regulations	Correct. An edit will be made.
Or	2.5.2	this is not guidance it is an enforceable scheme	Noted
SS	2.5.2	the permit scheme should only cover current legislation and regulations	It does but this is useful background information.
TW	2.5.3	The correct reference should be quoted when referring to regulations. '2007 Notice Regulations' should read ' The Street Works (Registers, Notices, Directions and Designations) (England) Regulations 2007	Correct. An edit will be made.
TW	2.6.1	Permit schemes include both permitting and noticing processes. A permit is not about booking time; time is only one small element of the permitting process.	The text in the document is correct and has been agreed before in other schemes.
SS	2.6.1	current schemes can include both noticing and permits . We do not “book” time for immediate or planned works, we give appropriate notice of our statutory duties to install and maintain an energy network	The text in the document is correct.
SS	2.6.2	· no they are not. Charges , fees and fines are not shown parity with HA works. See 2.8.2	The text in the document is correct.
VM	2.6.3	Virgin Media would like to make reference to the DfT advice (letter date 17 th March 2014) indicating that only the sector agreed condition matrix (HAUC Advice Note) will be acceptable.	This is noted, however the text in the document is correct.
TW	2.6.4	As a highway authority RBWM have always had control over	This is noted, however the text in the document

		extensions, running a permit scheme does not provide additional controls other than ability to impose a charge. Additionally, variations do not always impact the duration which this paragraph seems to indicate. As an undertaker who has been working within various permit schemes since 2010, the vast majority of variations we have issued do not change the end date of permits - they cover all manner of changes such as:- changes to TM, changes to conditions (by request of HA) etc.	is correct.
SS	2.6.4	· modifications or variations may not necessarily be for extensions. Changes to TM may be required for safety but may have no bearing on the duration of the permit.	The text in the document is correct.
Or	2.6.5	not required as a seperate point	This is just background information.
SS	2.6.6	PLease define the justification for this	All activities can cause disruption and therefor benefit from enhanced co-ordination. A fees matrix and Cost Benefit Analysis have been prepared and demonstrate the benefits of this approach.
VM	2.6.6 & 4.3.1	Virgin Media are disappointed that RBWM 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 RBWM grant permits for category 3 and 4 roads by default and for those permits to be at zero fee levels.	The fees for Permits for category 3 and 4 roads reflect the additional cost of increased co-ordination and has been identified when completing the DfT fees matrix.
TW	2.6.6	Please provide your justification for applying permits to all streets when the statutory guidance indicates the use of Strategically Significant streets is of utmost importance.	All activities can cause disruption and therefor benefit from enhanced co-ordination. A fees matrix and Cost Benefit Analysis have been prepared and demonstrate the benefits of this approach.
SS	2.7.1	· contradictory - its not working alongside the noticing	Elements of the NRSWA notice system remain.

		system its changing to a full permit scheme . The terminology and requirements are completely different to noticing.	
SS	2.8.1	· not sure what S 64, S 69 S 73A, S 88, S 89 , S 93, S 105 refer to under NRSWA 1991?	Please refer to the sections of NRSWA.
TW	2.8.4	How will these reports be generated and supplied and on what frequency? In what way will procedures be compared? What procedures are being compared?	A range of industry agreed KPIs that demonstrate this will be published annually. The tasks undertaken when an application is received will be the same for all Promoters.
SS	2.8.5	Revoking the permit scheme, please clarify, surely it is implemented or not, not sure you can revoke a scheme once in place	The text in the document is correct.
Section 3: Objectives of the Permit Scheme			
VM	3.1.1 & 3.1.3	Virgin Media agrees with the key factors highlighted. On the point about better planning, scheduling and management of activities to minimise disruption to any road user. Virgin Media agrees in an overall drive to further improve the timing and duration of works to minimise disruption, where safe and practical to do so. But Virgin Media already promotes improvements to timing and duration of works and there are many examples of innovation in working practices that have resulted in reduced occupation of the highway – advanced planning; use of minimum-dig technology; shared or sequential occupation of the carriageway etc. However, in seeking to reduce durations, utilities are best placed to estimate how long works will take, but should agree those times and be willing to justify them to RBWM when requested.	Noted.
SS	3.1.2	capacity of the street – please define, is this not traffic sensitivity? Any activities which involve TM may cause	This is a DfT description. Where the traffic flow is close to, or exceeds, the physical capacity of

		disruption	the street will clearly cause disruption.
TW	3.1.4	How does a permit scheme reduce carbon emissions, a permit scheme will not reduce the amount of work statutory undertakers complete as water mains need to be maintained, new developments are still being built and require all services - will there be a report demonstrating the current carbon emissions so the objective can be demonstrated in the regular review of the permit scheme and the performance against the objectives set?	An outcome of reduced congestion due to minimised disruption is the reduction in fuel consumption and CO ₂ emissions. The annual evaluation will include analysis of this.
NG	3.1.5	How will these be measured? What are the existing levels of disruption/delays/costs/carbon emissions? How have these existing levels been ascertained?	These are objectives. Some of these measures are available from DfT data. The Cost Benefit Analysis details much of this.
Section 4: Scope of the Permit Scheme			
SS	4.3.2	Do Geoplace not maintain the gazetteer?	No, The Authority maintains it and GeoPlace publishes it.
SS	4.3.3	via Geoplace and NSG updates	The text in the document is correct.
SS	4.5.1	Highways England	Correct, an edit will be made.
SS	4.6.1	What will be your method of advising the utility when a street has been adopted?	An update to the Local and National Street Gazetteer.
Section 5: Activities Covered by the Scheme			
TW	5.1.1	The code of Practice for Permits 2008 has not been in use since the release of the statutory guidance in October 2015.	An edit will be made.
Or	5.1.1	document obsolete	Noted
SS	5.1.1	Hasn't this been withdrawn?	Noted
SS	5.2.1	untrue if works are undertaken by highways authorities without a permit as they will not get an FPN or S 74 charges.	The text in the document is correct.
TW	5.2.2	Please clarify when these reports will be made available to	A range of industry agreed KPIs published

		other undertakers of work on the highway	annually.
SS	5.2.3	What measures are you putting in place to monitor this?	A range of industry agreed KPIs published annually.
Section 6: Exempt Activities			
NG	6.2	Please clarify as this appears to conflict with Paragraph 2.5.3 – the COP for permits has been superseded	The text in the document is correct and there is no conflict. 2.5.3 states that scheme must include both highway and statutory undertakers' works which this scheme does.
TW	6.2	Water companies undertake works upon Fire Hydrants on behalf of the fire service, will these works be exempt or have a reduced permit fee?	These works will require a Permit but will not be charged a fee.
VM	6.2.2	Virgin Media would like to add lifting chamber lids at non traffic sensitive streets, where we do not encroach on the carriageway, to enable cable pulling as this does not involve breaking up the street.	The text in the document is correct.
SS	6.2.2	· if working in a TS street at a TS time a permit is required for replacing a link box cover 5.1.2 (b) refers	The text in the document is correct.
Section 7: Permits - General			
SS	7.3.4	– what percentage and how is the discount to be calculated and applied?	Please see the fees table.
SS	7.4.1	· a registration may involve interim and permanent reinstatement a separate permit would not be required for interim, permanent and remedial reinstatements?	The text in the document is correct.
TW	7.4.3	It may be the intention to complete the work in one phase however, site conditions may prevent this from occurring. Currently our practice within other permit schemes is to state within the works description our intention to complete in one phase.	The text in the document is correct and is in line with the comment.
SS	7.4.4	Asset activity across more than 1 phase should be agreed in	This is so that activity across multiple Permits

		advance. Please clarify what you mean here, a PAA must be applied for and granted before applying for a permit on the same permit reference. Why would a PAA need to be cross referenced when its on the same permit number?	can be tracked.
SS	7.5.1	Not if the works are being done at different times. Separate permits will be required.	Noted, however, the text in the document is correct.
SS	7.5.2	PAA's only required for major works with a duration of more than 10 days or where a road closure or TTRO is required.	The text in the document is correct.
VM	7.5.3	A permit isn't always required at the customer connection stage of a job; Virgin Media suggests revising the paragraph to read 'If the installation of customer connections is undertaken at a later date then the Promoter shall apply for a separate Permit if required i.e. if registerable activity '	The text in the document is correct. It states 'If an activity relating to the installation of customer connections is undertaken at a later date then the Promoter shall apply for a separate Permit.'
VM	7.6.3	Virgin Media does not agree that a Permit fee should be charged in this case. This is an Authority imposed variation and therefore at no charge.	This is a feature of the scheme and the fee 'may' be charged.
SS	7.8.2	You have to specify the number of estimated inspection units as you cannot you cannot raise the permit request unless you do. Also it is common practice for the primary promotor to excavate and the secondary promotor to reinstate. Both parties therefore will need to shown the inspection units and the primary promotor will subsume to the secondary.	The text in the document is correct.
NG	7.8.5	We believe there needs to be greater incentives to promote collaborative working Would the Authority consider greater discounts?	As the scheme progresses and the effectiveness of discounts is better understood the discount levels may be reviewed.
SS	7.8.5	What is the mechanism for identifying and calculating the discount.	These will be recorded when the Permit is Granted as part of the business process.
SS	7.9.1	In other works, a new phase with a category of remedial work should be raised on the existing permit reference number.	The text in the document is correct.
NG	7.10	There appears to be an omission in 7.10.2 - bullet point 2	Yes, and edit will be made.

		relating to the starting window for minor activities - Please clarify	
SS	7.10.1	The duration will be shown in calendar days where a permit has fixed dates.	The text in the document is correct.
TW	7.10.2	EToN does not 'issue a permit' - a Grant/refusal or a permit modification (PMR) is issued. The only notification that allows the authority to add any conditions is the PMR and even then the promoter may or may not choose to issue a modified application. Terminology may need to be assessed.	Correct, an edit to 'issued' will be made.
TW	7.10.2	The only conditions that can be applied to permits are those listed in Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes – Permit Scheme Conditions March 2015.	Noted
TW	7.10.2	the second bullet point is incomplete - a number has been omitted from the beginning	Yes, and edit will be made.
Or	7.10.2	how many days	Yes, and edit will be made.
SS	7.10.2	Specify duration , 2 days.	Yes, and edit will be made.
SS	7.10.2	The permit end date will move when sending the start notice to reflect the duration. Also the duration will be shown in working days on a flexible permit.	The text in the document is correct.
SS	7.11.1	Please clarify the procedure for contacting the HA for an early start, eg e-mail, phone etc.	A phone call or an email are acceptable methods.
SS	7.13.1	If you don't require a permit its not an offence?	The text in the document is correct.
SS	7.13.2	An FPN cannot be issued unless a retrospective permit is raised.	The text in the document is correct.
Section 8: Permits - Types			
TW	8.2	please could we have the UK version of English rather than the US version	The text in the document is correct.
SS	8.2.1	No there is a forward planning notice but a PAA replaces a major initial notice. A permit replaces following a PAA replaces the confirmation notice	The text in the document is correct.

SS	8.2.6	The use of a forward planning notice should be used if the dates have not been confirmed.	The text in the document is correct.
Or	8.2.7	the fee for a PAA is chargeable on when a PA is granted.	The text in the document is correct.
Or	8.2.8	this full stop implies that they can refuse without a drastic change and without an explanation. if this was the case why would we pre book Road space with a PAA.	An edit will be made.
TW	8.3.1	For consistency with previous section this section could be labelled Permit Applications (PA). There is no definition of a 'Full Permit' the terminology should be Granted Permit	The text in the document is correct.
SS	8.2.8	A PAA should not be charged for if granted if the subsequent PA is refused.	The text in the document is correct.
SS	8.2.9	Please explain this? A copy of the application is held on Eton. Please clarify what you mean by any person having apparatus? We do not send a copy to all other utilities.	If requested by a relevant Authority or by any person having apparatus in the street a copy of the PAA is to be provided.
SS	8.3.4	Please explain this? A copy of the application is held on Eton. Please clarify what you mean by any person having apparatus? We do not send a copy to all other utilities.	If requested by a relevant Authority or by any person having apparatus in the street a copy of the Permit is to be provided.
Section 9: Permits - Classes			
SS	9.2.1	No, a major activity is also required for any road closure and for any activity where the duration exceeds 11 days.	The text in the document is correct.
SS	9.2.2	No also for works requiring a road closure.	The text in the document is correct.
TW	9.2.5/9.4.3/9.3.3	Conditions can not be applied on a 'blanket' basis as this paragraph seems to indicate; 'will' should be changed to 'may' as each permit must be assessed based on location, timings etc, so all conditions are specific to the PA	The text in the document is correct.
VM	9.5.5	Virgin Media do not believe this is a requirement under the Permits Code of Practice, please clarify?	It is a requirement of the scheme that an immediate activity is genuine.
SS	9.2.5	If applicable.	The text in the document is correct.
SS	9.3.3	Only if applicable.	The text in the document is correct.

SS	9.4.3	If applicable	The text in the document is correct.
SS	9.5.2	What will be the procedure if works commence outside normal working hours?	A phone call must be made to the phone number published on the NSG.
SS	9.5.5	How?	By providing appropriate evidence.
SS	9.5.6	If applicable	The text in the document is correct.
Section 10: Permit Applications			
SS	10.1.6	Are you planning to use standard refusal codes?	Yes, when available.
SS	10.3.1	send	The text in the document is correct.
SS	10.3.1	Where	The text in the document is correct.
SS	10.3.1	sent	The text in the document is correct.
SS	10.3.1	Please confirm how this is expected to be received in each medium. Eg a form or just an E_mail with the address details.	By telephone, email or fax for immediate activities or by email or fax for other applications or notices. A form will be provided.
TW	10.3.3	'EToN systems are designed to batch together and notifications which have failed to send due to either HA system failure or promoter server failure all resending is automatic so it is virtually impossible to add anything to any batch/notification which is in that process.	Noted
SS	10.3.3	Where permits are being "held in the system" they will automatically send once the system issue is resolved. We may not be able to amend the permit to show an individual reference number.	Noted
SS	10.5.1	Only if the NSG is set up correctly and the interested party details are shown.,	Noted
SS	10.5.2	How , on what medium?	By using the NSG.
SS	10.6.1	Please clarify what these sections refer to.	Please read NRSWA
NG	10.8.1	Does this mean that a PAA can be modified?	No.
Or	10.8.1	it would be better if, like other schemes, it stated that compliant applications will be granted as per regulation 9.	The text in the document is correct.

SS	10.8.1	Just a PMR	The text in the document is correct.
SS	10.8.2	PMR	The text in the document is correct.
Or	10.9.1	doesn't make sense, please rewrite.	This section will be rewritten.
SS	10.9.1	Contact? Discuss? Sentence incomplete. Where the S 58 is on the carriageway and works are in the footway this should not apply.	The text in the document is correct.
SS	10.10.1	Please clarify. Error on application PMR or refusal modified permit or works data variation to be sent.	An error in the data or information recorded.
SS	10.10.2	Depends on the error, a works data variation rather than a modified application may be appropriate especially where the works are in progress following application of an immediate permit.	Noted
TW	10.10.2	Error correction is a noticing term as it does not exist in a permit environment - this is known as varying works data which is undertaken on a variation which the authority has the option to grant or refuse - only if the changes are major and will therefore have a major impact on the network should the promoter contact the HA in advance of issuing this type of variation as there will be times when minor changes need to be notified when the HA may not be available to talk to unless RBWM are planning to offer a 24/7 permit office.	This relates to the correction of data recorded in the Permit Register.
SS	10.10.3	A modified application can be made without getting approval. It depends on the error. Only a works data variation requires agreement.	The text in the document is correct.
SS	10.10.4	No it isn't.	The text in the document is correct.
SS	10.10.5	Disagree, depends on the error.	The text in the document is correct.
Or	10.10.6	10.10.2 refers to a modified permit and as this is before it is granted it carries no fee. I would suggest at the end of this sentence you include "if discovered following the granting of the permit"	The text in the document is correct.

Section 11: Information Required in a Permit Application			
TW	11.1.1	the last three bullet points should read 'expected depth', 'intended reinstatement type' and 'Estimated inspection units'.	The text in the document is correct.
SS	11.1.1	Most of this is mandatory	The text in the document is correct.
SS	11.1.1	Not required	These are conditions that may be attached to the Permit.
SS	11.1.1	Not required on application	These are conditions that may be attached to the Permit.
SS	11.1.1	Estimated	These are conditions that may be attached to the Permit.
VM	11.2	There is no requirement for supplying out of hours contact and secondary promotor in EToN. Virgin Media can only apply with EToN Technical Specification.	It is reasonable that the contact details of any person appointed by the Promoter to deal with any problems that may occur during the activity, including any provision made for out-of-hours is supplied.
Section 12: USRN			
VM	12.3.4	The Works Activity Footprint (WAF) is not required. This underwent consultation in early 2011 and was not agreed by HAUC(UK) to be a requirement. Virgin Media does not agree therefore to supply this information.	The text states 'of required'.
Or	12.3.4	to answer the point above in addition should include accurate address details.	Noted.
SS	12.4.1	Times of day are not a requirement unless traffic sensitive and will be added as a condition of working.	The text in the document is correct.
TW	12.5	Please confirm that illustrations are acceptable via email/fax as Thames Water amongst many authorities and utilities do not have the facility to send via EToN (although we can receive)	Illustrations are acceptable by email and fax.

Or	12.5.1	Attachments are optional as per the EToN Tech Spec and therefore although may be requested cannot be made a must on the permit	The text in the document is correct.PAA & major works must be accompanied with an illustration so effective coordination can be performed.
SS	12.5.1	If plans attached at PAA stage there should be no requirement to resend at PA stage. If no TM is being used eg all works in Verge there should be no requirement for a detailed plan.	The text in the document is correct. The material is as appropriate.
VM	12.5.2	Virgin Media believe that 'Must' should be removed, as we would like justification as to why an illustration must be sent with standard and minor permit applications.	PAA & major works must be accompanied with an illustration so effective co-ordination can be performed.
VM	12.6.1	Virgin Media believe 'Must' should be removed. Technique may not be known in every instance up front. Virgin Media would like to suggest 'where known' also be added.	The text in the document is correct. This is the planned technique.
SS	12.6.1	Not always known and not mandatory. Other works involving or not involving excavation is commonly used.	The text in the document is correct. This is the planned technique.
SS	12.7.2	May not have been actioned or approved at the time of application.	The agreement by the relevant Parking Authority must be included in the Permit application.
VM	12.8.1	This field already exists within EToN.	Noted
SS	12.8.1	Not mandatory, not always known as may have to change depending on equipment in the highway. Where would this be recorded anyway? There is no field for these details.	Promoters must provide their best estimate. Permit applications must indicate wherever possible.
SS	12.9.1	Not mandatory, not always known dependent on time of day, time of year and weather.	The text in the document is correct.
TW	12.10.1	Provisional should be amended to 'Estimated', actual insoection units are only confirmed upon completion of the works	The text in the document is correct.

SS	12.10.2	Estimated inspection units and its mandatory as per Eton 6 when applying as a secondary promotor.	The text in the document is correct.
Section 13: Permit Conditions			
Or	13.1.3	this sentence is misleading as it implies that a set of RBWM wording will be required whereas in 13.2.1 below it states that the NCT will be used.	The conditions text ratified through HAUC (England) will be made available.
VM	13.1.4	Virgin Media would like to make reference to the DfT advice (letter date 17 th March 2014) indicating that only the sector agreed condition matrix (HAUC Advice Note) will be acceptable.	The conditions ratified through HAUC (England) will be used.
TW	13.1.4	The permit authority cannot define conditions that will be applied, can only utilise those conditions defined in the Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes – Permit Scheme Conditions Oct 2015. If this statement was intended to state that the authority has the right to select which conditions are to be applied to a permit then it should be reworded for clarity. Additionally seems to indicate that RWBM can apply a condition to all permits and as above, that is incorrect, there are currently only two conditions applicable to all permits and RWBM are not able to select others - this statement is contradictory to 13.2.1	The conditions ratified through HAUC (England) will be used.
Or	13.1.4	no they cant, Statutory Guidance dictates which are applied to all permits.	The text in the document is correct.
SS	13.1.5	This is not always feasible.	The Promoter should endeavour to have a copy, either electronic or hard copy, of the current Permit on site for inspection.
TW	13.3.1	'add 'by the use of the designation 'Early Notification of immediate works'	The text in the document is correct.
SS	13.3.1	Clarify procedure if required out of hours.	Promoters must contact the Permit Authority by telephone immediately, if identified in the NSG.

SS	13.3.4	Where immediate works have been completed eg over a weekend these may not be necessary as not applicable.	The text in the document is correct.
Section 14: Granting of Permits			
Or	14.4.1	regulations state that the scheme must set out grounds for refusal and a non-exhaustive list of examples is not setting out grounds. 14.4.1 should read the following sets out grounds that are likely to lead	Section 14.4 sets out the grounds for refusal.
SS	14.2.2	Only on TS streets. Not TS are in working days.	The text in the document is correct.
SS	14.3.1	Need full details of refusal not just a code	Sector agreed refusal codes, as approved by HAUC England, will be used.
TW	14.4	<p>As per regulation 9 in The Traffic Management Permit Scheme (England) Regulations 2007 as amended by The Traffic Management Permit Scheme (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 'A permit scheme shall set out the grounds on which a permit can be refused' . The reasons on which a valid permit can be refused must be stated within the scheme and these must relate to operational circumstances and not include an open ended statement but should include a site specific clause.</p> <p>Suggested replacement of this paragraph which is not compliant with regulations :-Grounds for refusal of a scheme compliant permit application will always relate to the Permit Authority's responsibility to discharge its Network Management Duty and are set out below. In an exceptional circumstance, where a specific situation affects, or will affect the Highway Network, the Permit Authority may invoke other grounds for refusal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflicting activities/events • Environmental considerations • Conflict with other Statute 	Section 14.4 sets out the grounds for refusal and has been consulted on and accepted before.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accuracy of/Conflicting/missing information • TTRO/PTS approvals • Works Methodology • Timing • Location • Duration • Section 58/58A restrictions • Traffic Management • Road Occupation dimensions • Traffic Space dimensions • Consultation and publicity • Missing Conditions within a single application 	
SS	14.4.3	Complete in a safe manner - sometimes this may require a longer duration eg working at depth and where shuttering may be require.	Noted
Or	14.4.6	"as per 14.4.5" as this would remove and doubt to what it refers to.	The text in the document is correct.
SS	14.4.5	Cannot refuse if we are required as statutory undertaker to maintain or repair our existing equipment.	The text in the document is correct.
Section 15: Review, Variation and Revocation of Permits and Permit Conditions			
VM	15.1	Virgin Media believes that the following should be stated in the paragraph - Permit Authority imposed variations are free of charge.	The text in the document is correct.
SS	15.2.1	New regulations apply	Noted. The text will be changed.
SS	15.2.2	Not where a valid extension request has been applied for and accepted.	Correct.
TW	15.5.2	Please add 'no permit fee will be charged for a variation initiated by the authority	The text in the document is correct.
SS	15.5.2	Modification.	The text in the document is correct.
SS	15.8.2	The permit authority issues an AIV . An authority imposed	The text in the document is correct.

		variation.	
SS	15.9.2	Only where works are in progress.	The text in the document is correct.
SS	15.10.2	Can only use works data variation or duration variation application as works in progress.	The text in the document is correct.
Or	15.11.1	not a must. "where one was provided" to be added	The text states, 'the following information as applicable'
SS	15.13.1	Only where safe to do so. If a cable is being repaired the work will need to be completed.	The text states that the Permit Authority will contact the Promoter to warn them of its intention and allow the situation to be discussed.
Section 16: Cancellation of a Permit (No comments received)			
Section 17: Fees			
Or	17.1.1	upon the granting of a PA associated	The text in the document is correct.
SS	17.2.3	How will this be identified, calculated and shown on the invoice.	These will be recorded when the Permit is Granted as part of the business process.
VM	17.5.1	What happens to revenue generated from permit fees if they exceed the allowable cost of the scheme?	As far as possible the fees and costs should be matched over a financial year. However, it is recognized that estimating the fee levels will involve incorporating the effect of various factors that will inevitably have a degree of uncertainty around them. In the event that fees and costs do not match the actual outturn for the year in question, adjustments may be made to fee levels for the subsequent years so that across a number of years fees do not exceed the allowable costs.
SS	17.6.2	This is not practical - monthly preferred.	This is an industry standard practice that will be followed.
Section 18: Sanctions (No comments received)			
Section 19: Dispute Resolution			

Or	19.2.2	it is not for this scheme to set the timescales for SEHAUC but it should state the it will follow the SEHAUC process.	It is important that parameters are defined so the process is not too lengthy.
Section 20: Registers			
NG	20.1.2	Will the register of Permits be available on the Authority's website?	Yes, a link will be provided.
Section 21: Transitional Arrangements (No comments received)			
Section 22: Permit Scheme Monitoring (No comments received)			
Section 23: APPENDIX A: Definition of terms used in the Permit Scheme			
Or	Appeal	these two definitions need reversing.	Yes, edit made.
Or	Bank Holiday	these two definitions need reversing.	Yes, edit made.
Or	Code of Practice for Permits	withdrawn April 2016	Noted
Or	Emergency Works	likely to cause what?	An edit will be made.
Or	Eton	capital N required	Correct. This will be changed.
Or	Registerable Activities	reference is invalid as the CoP has been withdrawn	An edit will be made.
Section 27: APPENDIX B - Permit Fees Table			
VM	Appendix B. Permit Fee Table	Virgin Media are disappointed that RBWM Permit Scheme and associated fees 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 RBWM grant permits for category 3 and 4 roads by default and for those permits to be at zero fee levels.	In line with guidance the scheme is focused on strategically significant streets. Charges for Cat 0-2 TSS streets are higher than for Cat 3-4 non TSS streets. The scheme cost is derived from a completed Permit Fees Matrix in a format provided by the DfT.

END OF DOCUMENT

Appendix B

Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Permit Scheme

Cost Benefit Analysis Summary – June 2016

Final version – 30 August 16 – to reflect final position

Costs

The costs associated with the scheme include the following Set up and operating expenditure and revenue in accordance with the Department for Transport's WebTAG.

- Total Set-up Expenditure **£120,000**
- Year 1 Operating Expenditure **£459,956**
- Annual Operating Expenditure (After Year 1) **£454,233**
- Year 1 Revenue from permits **£468,096**
- Annual Revenue from permits (After Year 1) **£466,784**

The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead will incur the set up expenditure for the first year only. Revenue is derived from the Permit fees charged to Utility companies. The operating expenditure is recovered by the revenue from the Permit fees..

Business Case

The development of a detailed Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) is a requirement of the formal application to the Secretary of State for a Permit Scheme or for making a Local Order.

The analysis assesses the impact of Permits over the full range of required social and economic variables that have been specifically agreed in consultation with the UK Department for Transport (DfT).

An effective CBA is a mechanism to assess the benefits and costs of an investment both in terms of its overall viability and in relation to other options.

The legislative guidance used for the study is contained within:

- Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes October 2015
- The Traffic Management Permit Scheme (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015
- Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA), Code of Practice for Permits, March 2006
- TMA, Permit Schemes, Decision-making and development (2nd Edition), November 2010
- WebTAG guidance Values of Time and Operating Costs (TAG Unit 3.5.6 October 2013).
- Department of Transport's (DfT) Halcrow study "Assessing the Extent of Streetworks and Monitoring Effectiveness of Section 74 in Reducing Disruption Volume 3 – Estimation of Cost of the Delay from Utilities' Street Works, June 2004"
- Chapter 8 of the Traffic Signs Manual DfT 2009
- Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 14 Economic Assessment of Road Maintenance

QUADRO software is able to appraise individual works that are planned in the future on different types of road by modelling the delay experienced by road users, quantify the delay and estimate the cost of the delay.

The software is able to calculate and convert delays in to monetary figures as detailed in WebTAG Unit 3.5.6. with assumptions in regard to valuation of time, operating costs and accidents.

Users are required to input base link specific details including network classification, traffic flows, road type characteristics and any diversion routes. Street work details including site length, works type such as lane closures and shuttle working. The latest version released in January 2014 Version 4 release 12 was used for the CBA. The QUADRO Manual is included in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 14 Economic Assessment of Road Maintenance DfT 2002.

The central assumption of the analysis is that the introduction of the Permit Scheme will cause a 5% fall in Permit applications, and have a commensurate effect on roadwork activity and all associated aspects of the analysis. This 5% reduction is known as the Permit Scheme reduction factor.

The key general economic assumptions included with the CBA are as follows:

- The scheme is anticipated to open in **late 2016 or early 2017**
- A **25** year appraisal length is assumed in accordance with DfT guidance
- A Discount Rate of **3.5%**, Combined Risk and Optimism Bias Factor **38%** in accordance with DfT guidance

Summary of Appraisal

The CBA determined the following key impacts of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Permit Scheme:

- The total number of Noticed works impacted by the scheme amounted to **6,914** of various length and duration.
- The annual delay cost for Utility works undertaken in Windsor and Maidenhead was **£214m** including a **20%** uplift in time reliability costs for urban roads.
- The number of Permits including an allowance of **20%** for phased works and reduction factor of **5%** amounted to **8,059**.
- The Permit scheme benefit at 5% is **£268m** with costs of **£10m** and a Net Present Value (NPV) of **£257m** giving a Benefit:Cost Ratio of **25.58:1**. A breakdown of benefits is shown on Table 1 below.
- A summary of the CBA consistent with WebTAG is shown on Table 2 below.

Table 1 Benefits Summary Values and Percentage 5% reduction in works impact 25 Years

Benefits	Value	Percentage of Total Benefit
Consumer Travel Time	£146,137,475	55%
Consumer Vehicle Operating Costs	£10,369,851	4%
Business Travel Time	£105,528,261	39%
Business Vehicle Operating Costs	£3,369,150	1%
Private Sector Provider Operating Costs	£635,055	0%

Reduction in Fuel Revenue	-£1,424,889	1%
Greenhouse Gases	£1,618,419	1%
Accidents	£1,489,067	1%
Net Present Value of Benefits	£267,722,390	

Table 2: Summary of CBA

Analysis of Monetised Costs and Benefits (5% Work Saving) 25 Years

Noise	-	-12
Local Air Quality	-	-13
Greenhouse Gases	1,618,419	-14
Journey Quality	-	-15
Physical Activity	-	-16
Accidents	1,489,067	-17
Economic Efficiency: Consumer Users (Commuting)	156,507,327 (1a)	
Economic Efficiency: Consumer Users (Other)	- (1b)	
Economic Efficiency: Business Users and Providers	109,532,466	-5
Wider Public Finances (Indirect Taxation Revenues)	1,424,889	- (11) - sign changed from PA table, as PA table represents costs, not benefits
Present Value of Benefits (see notes) (PVB)	267,722,390	(PVB) = (12) + (13) + (14) + (15) + (16) + (17) + (1a) + (1b) + (5) - (11)
Broad Transport Budget	10,465,891	-10
Present Value of Costs (see notes) (PVC)	10,465,891	(PVC) = (10)
OVERALL IMPACTS		
Net Present Value (NPV)	257,256,499	NPV=PVB-PVC
Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR)	25.58	BCR=PVB/PVC

Note : This table includes costs and benefits which are regularly or occasionally presented in monetised form in transport appraisals, together with some where monetisation is in prospect. There may also be other significant costs and benefits, some of which cannot be presented in monetised form. Where this is the case, the analysis presented above does NOT provide a good measure of value for money and should not be used as the sole basis for decisions. All values in £s.