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1 Executive Summary

The Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA), Part 3 and the Traffic Management Permit Scheme (England) Regulations 2007 as amended in 2015, makes provision for Permit Schemes to be introduced in England. The South East Permit Scheme (SEPS) was introduced and adopted by Surrey County Council (SCC) on the 11th of November 2013.

This report sets out an overview of SEPS operational performance in its 3rd year in Surrey; November 2015 - November 2016; and provides detailed scrutiny of the available data in relation to both Street Works and Works for Road Purposes (WRP) activities in Surrey for this period.

Operation of the Permit Scheme continues to be extremely advantageous for Surrey CC (SCC) in fulfilling the Authority’s Network Management Duty under the TMA, not only for day-to-day activities, but also for successful delivery of the many large, high profile events which take place across the County, such as the RideLondon-Surrey Cycle events, and the Half Marathons which take place in Reigate, Woking, Weybridge, Thames Ditton and Thorpe throughout the year – all of which require full road closures on event days and careful coordination with Streetworks activities beforehand.

The information contained within this report illustrates the Scheme is being operated successfully and that the necessary parity of approach between Street Works and WRP remains consistently applied. Whilst the primary focus of the permit scheme is on disruptive works on Traffic Sensitive streets, Surrey’s residents, motorists, businesses and Elected Members, demand that an appropriate level of scrutiny be applied to all activities undertaken on all streets. This ensures that all activities are undertaken safely, in the most timely manner and with the minimum disruption. The very low levels of ‘deemed’ (non-scrutinised) permits across all roads/works types illustrates that this requirement of SCC Officers is recognised and fully addressed.
A major benefit remains the Permitting of activities for WRP, (activities undertaken by Highway Authorities). This has greatly improved visibility of these works and allows for comprehensive coordination of works, provides SCC with greater opportunity to protect its asset – particularly following major replacement and upgrade of its Highway Assets - and clearly demonstrates parity of Scheme application across all works promoters, a key objective of the Traffic Management Act.

With data from 3 years of operation to review, trends are starting to be identified, for example, the number of initial permit applications received has reduced again along with ‘days of highway occupancy’. Conversely, the number of permit variation requests has increased in year 3, potentially indicating the need for further careful planning of activities in the first instance, and increasing the workload of the Surrey’s Streetworks team. However a longer period of evaluation is required to further validate any such trends.

Surrey Officers remain concerned by the increasing level of non-compliance to conditions placed upon permits, on the basis that each permit is only granted on the provision that the necessary permit conditions are adhered to. SCC hopes that the soon to be published HAUC Guidance Document on Permit Scheme Operation gives further clarification on the interpretation of National Condition Text, which may help decrease the percentage of sites failing to adhere to the permit conditions placed upon them.

With the fee structure set at the outset of the Scheme, the third year of operation generated an invoiced amount of £996,944.82. (Including £27,804.90 of permit fee discounts for works undertaken wholly outside Traffic Sensitive times)

The costs to the Authority attributable to operating the Scheme for undertakers, which are over and above the costs of the Authorities co-ordination Duty under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 for year three of operation totaled £1,127,430.20.

In line with previous years of operation, it can be seen that income from Permit fees has not adequately covered the additional costs borne by SCC to operate the Scheme with a shortfall of £130,485.38 for the third year. Detail is contained within this report.

As such the Authority will now, in line with ‘Part 6 – Fees’ of the Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes, consider a review of Team Structure/Permit fee levels. Any such proposed changes to permit fees will be subject to the appropriate consultation.
The SCC review of the Traffic Sensitive Streets designation within its Street Gazetteer referred to in the Year Two report is currently on hold with a conclusion to this exercise anticipated later in 2017.

All base data used in the report, except where identified, is taken from the Electronic Transfer of Notices (EToN) compliant ‘Symology Insight’ system used by SCC to manage street works activities.
2 Introduction

Sharing its borders with Greater London, Kent, East and West Sussex, Hampshire and Berkshire, its proximity to London, Heathrow and Gatwick airports, access to major arterial road routes (including the M25, M3, A3, M23 and A25), as well as frequent rail services into London and beyond, Surrey is an attractive County both for businesses to locate to and for people to live in.

Surrey is the second smallest Shire County in the South East but one of the most densely populated in England with 6.9 persons per hectare against a national average of 4.1 persons per hectare. 2015 figures show the population to be 1.17 million. This is projected to increase by 19% over the next 25 years.

Due to its proximity to London there are many commuter towns and villages hence the population density. Much of the North East of the County is an urban area contiguous to Greater London. In the west, there is a conurbation straddling the Hampshire/Surrey border.

62% of the population is of working age (16-65). With 14% of Surrey’s working population doing so from home, 86% are reliant on the highway network when travelling to and from their place of work. Surrey contributes more in personal income tax revenue to the Exchequer than any other area excluding London.

The County Council has responsibility for 3,000 miles of road network; with many of Surrey’s roads forming tactical diversion routes for Highways England’s Network including the M25, M23 and M3 diversion routes.

Parts of Surrey’s road network are experiencing severe congestion and are at capacity during peak hours. ‘A’ roads across Surrey carry 64% more traffic than the national average.

Proposed growth in housing, retail and employment will put additional pressure on Surrey’s roads, as will developments outside the County such as the Aldershot Urban Extension in Hampshire and Whitehall/Bordon eco-town in West Sussex. The availability and maintenance of the County’s roads is vital to the economic prosperity of both Surrey and the South East region.
The County Council’s 'Confident in our Future' Corporate Strategy 2016-21 sets out the vision and objectives for the county over the next five years. The document has three strategic goals that the Council aims to achieve for all Surrey residents; Wellbeing, Economic Prosperity and Resident Experience. The SCC Highways and Transport Strategic Business Plan details how Surrey Highways link into this corporate strategy

- Wellbeing
  Highways Input - Make the network safer for all users
- Economic Prosperity
  Highways Input - Improve Network availability
- Resident Experience
  Highways Input - More Free flowing Networks

These objectives are supported by the operation of the Permit Scheme.

Surrey’s third local transport plan is a statutory document entitled the Surrey Transport Plan. The new plan commenced from April 2011 and looks ahead to 2026. It sets out the strategy to help people to meet their transport and travel needs effectively, reliably, safely and sustainably within Surrey in order to promote economic vibrancy, protect and enhance the environment, improve the quality of life, and reduce carbon emissions.

It includes the stated objectives:

- Effective transport: To facilitate end-to-end journeys for residents, business and visitors by maintaining the road network.
- Reliable transport: To improve the journey time reliability of travel in Surrey.
- Safe transport: To improve road safety and the security of the travelling public in Surrey.

These objectives are supported by the operation of the Permit Scheme.

Figures supplied by Elgin show that public interest in road works in Surrey remains the highest in the South East with circa 674,000 enquires made via the www.roadworks.org website during 2015/16, an increase of over 40% from the previous year. This emphasises the need to employ a robust system such as the South East Permit Scheme (SEPS) to effectively manage the Surrey highway network.
The SEPS became operational on the 11th of November 2013 having being approved by the Secretary of State as a Common Scheme under legislation in place at the time with the initial membership of East Sussex and Surrey County Councils. Bracknell Forest, West Berkshire, Slough and Wokingham Councils subsequently joined the Scheme.

Changes to legislation have removed the legal term of a ‘Common’ Permit Scheme, however the six Authorities continue to operate under the SEPS governance model to provide consistency of approach. A Statutory Undertakers Liaison Forum, chaired by SCC, exists to give governance on the running of Schemes within SEPS.

Officers from SCC also play active roles in the National Permit Authority Group, the HAUC (England) Permit Forum and the National Traffic Managers Forum.

The Statutory Guidance for Highway Permit Schemes was issued by the Department for Transport in October 2015 and the third year of operation of the Scheme in SCC is compliant with this document. In addition to providing guidance, this document removed the necessity for the Secretary of State to approve new or changes to existing Schemes.

Part 6 (6.11) of the document introduced the statutory requirement to offer discount Permit fees when works on streets designated as Traffic Sensitive are undertaken wholly outside of Traffic Sensitive times. In year 3 of operation this discount totaled £27,804.90.

The release date of this document also acted as the final date for Authorities to adopt the National Permit Conditions (replacing the previous SEPS Standard and Model Conditions). All works in Surrey in year 3 of Scheme operation where carried out using National Permit Conditions.

2016 saw the release of the DfT Advice Note “For local highway authorities developing new or varying existing permit schemes”. Any variation to the Surrey Permit Scheme will comply with this document.

At the time of writing the industry is awaiting the publication of the HAUC (England) Advice note entitled “Guidance on the Operation of Permit Schemes (incl. Permit Condition Text). The hope is that this document will introduce clarity into the application of and compliance with National Permit Conditions, as this remains a challenge within the industry.
Focus during the third operating year continued to be on embedding the principles of the Permit Scheme and identifying opportunities for further collaboration by activity promoters.

Due to system limitations, data runs for performance statistics are taken from 1\textsuperscript{st} of November through to the 31\textsuperscript{st} of October each year as opposed to the Scheme introduction date of the 11\textsuperscript{th} of November.
3 Objectives of the SCC (SEPS) Permit Scheme

SCC has a duty under Section 59 of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (NRSWA) to co-ordinate works of all kinds on the highway. In addition section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 requires us to manage our road network with a view to achieving, so far as may be reasonably practicable having regard to our other obligations, policies and objectives, the following overriding objectives:

“Securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority’s road network; and facilitating the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority”.

Effective co-ordination and management by the highway authority is essential to minimise traffic disruption whilst allowing activity promoters the necessary time and space to complete their activities. SCC is committed to reducing congestion and managing the network efficiently to secure the expeditious movement of traffic. The operation of the Permit Scheme contributes to this objective.

The strategic objectives for the Permit Scheme are taken from the council’s Strategic Transport Plan, namely;

‘To help people to meet their transport and travel needs effectively, reliably, safely and sustainably within Surrey; in order to promote economic vibrancy, protect and enhance the environment and improve the quality of life.’

The aim of the Permit Scheme is to improve the management of the road network through better planning, scheduling and management of activities so as not to cause avoidable traffic disruption to any highway user.

Co-ordination of activities through the Permit Scheme enables differences between those competing for space or time in the street, including traffic, to be resolved in a positive and constructive way.
The specific objectives for the Surrey Permit Scheme are to;

1. Manage and maintain the local highway network to maximise the safe and efficient use of road space and provide reliable journey times, including:
   - Providing for people with a disability,
   - Minimise other impacts on the community,
   - Improve public satisfaction

2. Encourage a proactive, rather than reactive, attitude to activities by works promoters. This change in culture will result in the supply of more information to the Permit Authority, which will better enable it to manage the network.

3. Protect the structure of the street and the integrity of apparatus in it.

4. Ensure safety for those using, living or working on the street, including those engaged in activities controlled by the Scheme, with special emphasis on people with disabilities.

Information contained within this Year 3 report and ongoing anecdotal evidence from SCC’s Officers, Statutory Undertakers and other Stakeholders, demonstrate that the Permit Scheme is continuing to meet all the objectives set out above, specific examples are;

- Through proactive use of Permit Modification Requests (PMRs) and Permit Conditions SCC has been able to coordinate activities to a far greater extent than previously. This results in more efficient use of road space and helps to produce more reliable journey times, by positively programming works to avoid clashes on the network. In particular these tools, along with use of Elgin’s Traffic Management App within the roadworks.org site, have made a significant improvement to the avoidance of works planned on the diversion routes of other road closures. We have also been able to provide Highways England with far greater surety on the use of their tactical diversion routes – currently under review with stakeholders.
• This enhanced use of PMRs and Permit Conditions, along with maintaining the increase in the level of on-site inspections brought about by operation of the Permit Scheme, helps ensure that specific provisions for people with a disability, and other bespoke considerations on local communities can be better identified and mitigated.

• Regrettably data on public satisfaction with road works remains difficult to draw from current systems which only record contacts on the subject – not necessarily dissatisfaction, however Surrey’s further enhanced use of the Elgin Comms App to improve online content of roadworks information and the volume of public use of roadworks.org site (also embedded within SCC’s own website) indicates a public more engaged with the activity and using the tools provided to ‘self-serve’. This will help towards improving visibility and satisfaction.

• Partners in Surrey Police’s Road Traffic Unit report that complaints they receive about roadworks across Surrey have remained significantly lower since the commencement of the Permit Scheme, compared with the level of complaints received prior to the scheme commencement.

• The cultural shift to Permit Scheme operation within both planning and operational teams, across both Statutory Undertakers and SCC’s Officers continues to drive a far more proactive and considered approach to the planning and execution of all works.

• Continued better planning and coordination of activities since Scheme commencement have significantly improved the asset management capability of all works promoters – SCC included. A greater number of Major works are now planned more effectively in order to ensure a granted Permit and coordinated approach which has resulted in a larger number of works having Section 58 protection of the asset. This is a key improvement given Surrey’s major capital investment in its carriageway asset under ‘Operation Horizon’ over the past three years and its forthcoming capital investment across many of the Authority’s other highway assets.
- Site safety, including that of operatives on sites has been improved by operation of the Permit Scheme, due to the increased planning necessary at the early stage of activities in order to receive a granted Permit. Again, a higher number of site inspections through Scheme operation, along with appropriate use of PMRs and Permit Conditions have helped to drive increased focus on the best means to complete activities in a timely manner, without compromising safety of the general public and site operatives. A particular improvement has been noted in year 3 scheme operation by Surrey’s own Highways Contractors – evident in their improved KPI scoring, of which site safety inspections is a key component measure.
4. Fee Structure

Income (Third Year of Scheme Operation)

The fee structure set at the outset of the Scheme, for the year 11th November 2015 through to 10th November 2016 has generated an invoiced amount of £996,944.82.

Fees charged are as per the table below and are unchanged for years 1, 2 and 3 of Scheme operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisional Advanced Authorisation</th>
<th>Main Roads</th>
<th>Minor Roads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 0, 1, 2 streets and Traffic Sensitive (at any time) 3 &amp; 4 streets</td>
<td>£83</td>
<td>£66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and 4 streets and non Traffic Sensitive streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Activity less than 4 days duration</td>
<td>£58</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Activity 4 to 10 days duration</td>
<td>£127</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Activity over 10 days and all major works requiring a TTRO</td>
<td>£216</td>
<td>£141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Activity</td>
<td>£127</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Activity</td>
<td>£58</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Activity</td>
<td>£52</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Variation</td>
<td>£45</td>
<td>£35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Income Breakdown Year 3 Invoiced Amounts

Permit Advanced Authorisation

Total amount invoiced for Permit Advanced Authorisations **£61,938.40**

(Note PAA’s are only payable on the subsequent submission and granting of an associated Permit Application).
Permit Application – Major Works

**Permit Application - Major Works - Less than 4 days duration**

- **Cat 0, 1, 2(T/S)**: £6,419.10
- **Cat 0, 1, 2(Non-T/S)**: £573.00
- **Cat 3, 4(T/S)**: £5,339.00
- **Cat 3, 4(Non-T/S)**: £18,330.00

**Permit Application - Major Works - 4 to 10 days duration**

- **Cat 0, 1, 2(T/S)**: £2,222.20
- **Cat 0, 1, 2(Non-T/S)**: £-
- **Cat 3, 4(T/S)**: £1,307.40
- **Cat 3, 4(Non-T/S)**: £10,575.00

**Permit Application - Major Works - Over 10 days**

- **Cat 0, 1, 2(T/S)**: £13,262.40
- **Cat 0, 1, 2(Non-T/S)**: £-
- **Cat 3, 4(T/S)**: £8,424.00
- **Cat 3, 4(Non-T/S)**: £71,152.50

Charts 4, 5 and 6 Permit Application Major Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Major Works **£137,604.60**
Permit Application – Standard Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Standard Works £125,054.36

Permit Application – Minor Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Minor Works £317,142.06
Permit Applications – Immediate (Emergency) Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Immediate (Emergency) Works £42,083.60

Permit Applications – Immediate (Urgent) Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Immediate (Urgent) Works £110,836.00
Permit Variations – Major Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Major Works £27,018.00
Permit Variations – Standard Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Standard Works £56,571.00

Permit Variations – Minor Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Minor Works £73,011.80

Charts 14 and 15 Permit Variations Standard and Minor Works
Permit Variations – Immediate (Emergency) Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Immediate (Emergency) Works £21,700.00

Permit Variations – Immediate (Urgent) Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Immediate (Urgent) Works £23,985.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total amount invoiced for Permit Advanced Authorisations</td>
<td>£61,938.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Major Works</td>
<td>£137,604.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Standard Works</td>
<td>£125,054.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Minor Works</td>
<td>£317,142.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Immediate (Emergency) Works</td>
<td>£42,083.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Immediate (Urgent) Works</td>
<td>£110,836.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Major Works</td>
<td>£27,018.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Standard Works</td>
<td>£56,571.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Minor Works</td>
<td>£73,011.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Immediate (Emergency) Works</td>
<td>£21,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Immediate (Urgent) Works</td>
<td>£23,985.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£996,944.82</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Permit Income Year 3

(Discount given for works undertaken wholly outside of Traffic Sensitive times on Traffic Sensitive streets totaled £27,804.90 and is accounted for in the numbers above)
5 Costs and Benefits

Costs

Cost figures used are standard SCC rechargeable resource costs at Mid Rate on the SCC Rate Card. This is in line with Part 6.5 of the Statutory Guidance for Highway Authorities Permits Schemes October 2015. See Appendix 1

(Mid Rate: - Includes all costs from the baseline, plus employee driven corporate support costs such as office accommodation, IT, HR, training and insurance. Also includes corporate overhead costs such as Finance, Procurement, Democratic Services, Policy and Performance. It is recommended that at least this rate is used for most situations).

SCC reviews salaries and charge rates annually. Any rate revisions are, from 2016 introduced on the 1st of July annually. There was no change to the SCC Rate Card at the 1st of July 2016.

In line with previous reports, detail of actual staff in post has been used to calculate total staff charge rates rather than a generic number of posts. i.e. not all posts have been continually occupied throughout the time the Scheme has been in operation. Appendix 2 details

The Authority is permitted to recover costs and overheads attributable to operating the Scheme for undertakers which are over and above the costs of the Authorities co-ordination Duty under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. The additional costs in operating a Permit Scheme associated to the County Councils own highway works cannot be recovered. Appendix 3 details

It is not practicable to derive an exact split of time spent reviewing Permit applications for Street Works against Permit applications for Works for Road Purposes, nor for the time spent by Officers inspecting compliance with Permit Conditions between the two work strands. A reasonable logical rationale has been used to apportion staff time between differing activity types, and remains consistent with that reported in Years 1 and 2.
Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Works Officer</td>
<td>sp8</td>
<td>£309,304.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Coordinator</td>
<td>sp8</td>
<td>£408,580.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Network Coordinator</td>
<td>sp7</td>
<td>£16,613.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Coordination Admin</td>
<td>sp6</td>
<td>£48,276.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Technical Support Officer</td>
<td>sp9</td>
<td>£81,475.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Support Officer</td>
<td>sp7</td>
<td>£163,224.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Costs Year 3

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£1,127,430.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Shortfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 Report</td>
<td>£942,205.52</td>
<td>£1,057,788.00</td>
<td>£115,582.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 Report</td>
<td>£993,526.56</td>
<td>£1,100,420.00</td>
<td>£106,893.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs to SCC Year 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,127,430.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income from Permit Fees Year 3</td>
<td>£996,944.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall Year 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£130,485.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 year Totals</td>
<td>£2,932,676.90</td>
<td>£3,285,638.00</td>
<td>£352,961.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Shortfall per Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£117,653.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Financial Position End of Year 3

*This figure incorrectly reported in previous report as £115,537.48

SCC apply a discount rate of 30% to Permit fees for works on traffic sensitive streets conducted wholly outside of traffic sensitive times. This discount rate is applied irrespective of whether the works were planned by the promoter or directed by the Permit Authority to be undertaken at these non traffic sensitive times.

Over the period of this Permit report fees were reduced by **£27,804.90** as a result of this discount.
Any future proposed changes to Permit fee levels will need to remain within the maximum levels set by statute, as set out in the table below;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Main Roads</th>
<th>Minor Roads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Advanced Authorisation</td>
<td>£105</td>
<td>£77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Activity less than 4 days duration</td>
<td>£65</td>
<td>£45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Activity 4 to 10 days duration</td>
<td>£130</td>
<td>£75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Activity over 10 days and all major works requiring a TTRO</td>
<td>£240</td>
<td>£150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Activity</td>
<td>£130</td>
<td>£75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Activity</td>
<td>£65</td>
<td>£45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Activity</td>
<td>£60</td>
<td>£40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit Variation</td>
<td>£45</td>
<td>£35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits

Reduced overall durations for works, collaborative working and the appropriate application of and adherence to Permit Conditions, are factors which best assess the effect of the Permit Scheme on reducing traffic disruption.

The current EToN system – Symology Insight - used by SCC has no facility to record where durations have been reduced as a result of communication between authority and works promoter and therefore, we are currently unable to accurately quote data on “days saved” as a result of the Permit Scheme operation. Resolutions to this are still being explored for inclusion in future reports, however progress on the development of such reports has been problematic.
EToN provides the opportunity for the works promoter to identify collaborative working on the Permit application. Whilst it is known that a substantial degree of collaborative working is taking place, without the works promoter correctly identifying this on the Permit application it is not possible to accurately report on the number of occurrences and the associated days of highway occupation saved.

With the recent announcement of the DfT ‘StreetManager’ project to explore future options on how streetworks data can be exchanged, managed and reported upon, along with the DfT’s wider assessment in 2017 of the success of Permit Schemes Nationally, it is hoped that in future new reporting tools will be more readily available to report on scheme benefits.

Surrey’s Officers will continue to explore time efficient ways to accurately provide valid data to support the current anecdotal evidence of the benefits of the permit scheme operation in these areas. Conclusions can be drawn from much of the data provided in this report, however we continue to seek specific reports on the “days saved” and “collaborative working” measures, to better illustrate the benefits achieved.

One such typical example of good practice would be recent works on the B2032 Station Road and Pebble Hill Road, Betchworth. Under a single road closure the following works were carried out;

- Openreach - Contractor resource replaced a carriageway box frame and cover in Station Road
- Openreach-Direct Labour resource replaced a telegraph pole and cabling on Pebble Hill Road
- SCC’s term contractor Kier made road side structure inspections on retaining walls on both Station Road and Pebble Hill Road
- SCC’s term contractor Kier, removed overgrown vegetation.
6 Performance Indicators

6.1 PI1 The number of Permit and Permit Variation Applications

The table below shows a breakdown of Permit applications received, Granted and Refused for the third year of Scheme operation in Surrey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permits Received / Granted / Refused</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Permit Applications received by Surrey County Council: (Symology/PPI 104)</td>
<td>48,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Applications (Permit and Variation) received by Surrey County Council: (Symology/PPI 106)</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,472</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Permit Variation Applications received by Surrey County Council: (Calculation 106 - 104)</td>
<td>19,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Applications with status that cannot be determined: (Permit phases Cancelled before Granted / Deemed) (Symology/PPI 111)</td>
<td>3,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Applications Granted or Refused: (Calculation)</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,404</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Applications (Permit and Variation) Granted: (Symology/PPI 108)</td>
<td>53,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Applications (Permit and Variation) Refused: (Symology/PPI 109)</td>
<td>5,565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Permits Granted and Refused (not PMR)

These figures are derived from system driven reports based on the latest Permit Performance Indicators specified by the HAUC Permit Performance Working Group and the Permits Forum. See Appendix 4
The charts below show Permits Granted, Permits Refused and Permits Refused as a Percentage of Permits Granted. This is shown as a total and split WRP and Street Works.

Charts 18, 19 and 20 Permits Granted / Refused with Percentage Year 3
Each application has an appropriate response period which means that the number of applications received in any one period does not necessarily correspond to the Permits Granted and Refused within that same period. In other words, a Permit application received in one period may be responded to within the next period. This means that there a number of Permit applications, the status of which cannot be determined.

Number of Permit Applications

The adjacent graph shows the split of Initial Permit applications received from both highway authority (WRP) and utility promoters (Street Works).

For the third year of Scheme operation, WRP generated 23% and street works 77% of the applications received.
6.1.2 Analysis

**Number of Permit Applications and Variations**

There has been a further decrease in the total number of Permit Applications. Whilst year two showed a 25% drop on year one volumes, the decrease in year three was only 9% on year two figures. This is reflected similarly in both Street Works and WRP. Whilst it is still relatively early to extrapolate trends after just three years of scheme operation, it is hoped that this year-on-year reduction is reflective of improved scheduling of activities. Should this downward trend continue, consideration will be given as to what resource levels are appropriate for successful scheme operation.

Variation applications have increased from 13,942 in year one to 17,544 in year two to 19,593 in year three. This is a potentially disappointing trend as it may represent poor planning of the execution and timeliness of activities, creating higher work levels for the Authority.

Cancellations, information on which is not included per se within this report, have reduced broadly in line with the reduction in initial Permit Applications.

**Permits Granted and Refused**

The difference in overall refusal rates (Charts 18 to 21) of Street Works (13.16%) and WRP (5.5%) respectively, continue to demonstrate the close working relationship which is possible between the Surrey Street Works team and internal works promoters, potentially prior to any permit application proper.

This also reflects use of Immediate (Urgent) Permits by SCC to undertake reactive works such as pothole repairs where volumes of works are high and durations short. Permits can be submitted retrospectively and many works may already be completed before Permit application content is scrutinised.

Reviewing Refusals by percentage by works category (Chart 21) in year three of Scheme operation, there remains general parity between Street Works and WRP. There has been an overall increase in Refusal rates in Year 3 in all but the WRP Major Works category which may be indicative of the close working relationship developed between internal teams within SCC notably on planning of larger projects.
The key factors in the overall percentage increase in initial permit applications refused is not yet clear and Surrey Officers continue to endeavor to draw reports on permit refusals by ‘Response Code’, but it is considered to likely be a combination of:

- increased levels of scrutiny
- increased use of permit scheme powers
- clearer understanding of what National Conditions are appropriate on a job-by-job basis
- development of skills and experience of SCC Officers
- errors/lack of clarity of permit application content
- enhanced coordination of activities
- better use of the Elgin TM App, which allows Surrey Officers better insight into potential works clashes on diversion routes for other activities.
6.2 PI2 The number of Conditions applied by Condition type.

Chart 23 Permit Conditions

Note must be made that the information above is dependent on the works promoter correctly identifying the EToN Condition type when submitting the Permit application. SCC Streetworks team have no influence on this data set. (Illustrated by the percentage of ‘Local’ condition selected, actually redundant since the use of National Condition Text). The graph above broadly follows the profile seen in years 1 and 2.

6.3 The Number of Approved Revised Durations.

Chart 24 Duration Variation Applications as % of Works phases Started
From time to time an activity promoter will need to apply for an extension of the agreed duration. The Permit Scheme does not prevent necessary activity, reasonable variations are likely to be granted, although the authority may if necessary vary any Conditions attached to the original Permit or add new ones. Requests to extend the duration of works are considered individually on their own merits and Chart 25 illustrates in line with previous years that the majority of Duration Variation requests are granted.

The gas industry makes the most applications to vary durations, although year 3 of Scheme Operation has seen an appreciable increase in Variations Applications from the Power supply industry. The figures in general show small increase on figures published for years 1 and 2 of Scheme operation.

Not all agreements of a revised duration of the Permit will allow for an increase in the “reasonable period” for the works to take place. This will be considered for each application and the promoter informed if this should be the case. In this situation the works promoter may be allowed to stay occupying the highway however over run charges will be applied.
6.4 The Number of occurrences of reducing the application period

This KPI was considered to be in relation to the number of times promoters were allowed by SCC to start their works without having to comply with the minimum Permit application lead-in period; this is commonly known as an Early Start. (It should be noted that with a Permit Scheme it is not possible to have a non agreed early start, this would be classed as working without a Permit).

The above charts shows that in general the gas industry makes the most applications to reduce the notification period of any promoter. In broad outline, figures have some similarity year on year and further data is required to comment on any trend. Early start requests are considered individually on their own merits by SCC and are never refused without a valid reason.
7 HAUC TPI measures

see appendix 6

This section outlines the Permit Indicators (TPI) agreed by the National TPI working group, set out in the Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes October 2015

7.1 TPI1 Works Phases Started (Base Data) - 39,268

7.2 TPI2 Works Phases Completed (Base Data) - 39,514

7.3 TPI3 Days of Occupancy - 436,460

In line with Initial Permit Applications, there has been a year on year decrease in the number of Works Phases Started – TPI 1. With a 4% year 2 to year 1 decrease and a 1.65% year 3 to year 2 decrease.

Days of highway occupancy figures also reflect the above with figures for year 3 representing a 5.5% decrease over Year 1 figures however this is attributable to a decrease in works by minor promoters as all major promoter figures show an increase in his respect.

The figure supplied for days of occupancy must however be treated with caution as the ‘occupancy’ is calculated using the works start and works stop dates declared on the Permit. It may be that sites are not occupied at times during this period or indeed actually set up on the highway.
For example, for a new water main installation a Permit may run for three months, one month of main laying, one month of chlorination where there is no site occupancy and one month of service transfers once the main pipe is proven.

On Permits relating to Traffic Sensitive Streets, whilst the end date of the Permit is agreed, works can start at any time after the start date on the Permit. For example with a Standard Permit, work may be agreed in a ten day window however they may not start until day three. This is acceptable and within legislation as long at the finish date is retained.

Works that are declared closed but actually continue on the highway (over runs) are not included in this highway occupancy figure.
### 7.4 TPI4 Average Duration of Works Phases Completed

Split works type by Major Promoter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Works promoter</th>
<th>Works Type</th>
<th>Average duration(days) of completed works phases - Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affinity Water</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>36.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Water</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>40.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>8.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES Water</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>84.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>17.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Grid Gas</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>32.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT Openreach</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Media</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>13.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>9.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>20.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>8.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Highway Occupancy by promoter by Works Type
7.5 TPI5 Phases Completed on time 44,173*

7.6 TPI6 Number of deemed Permit applications 20

7.7 TPI8 Number of Phase One Permanent Registrations 16,109**

* These figures represent where the works promoter has issued a clear / closed notice on time and does not allow for works ongoing past the clear / closed date. (PPI 102 – PPI 105)

** These figures are system generated and do not align with what is seen in practice.

The figure against TPI8 is a slight reduction from the second year of scheme operation (from 16,237**) despite the introduction of the permit discount for activities wholly completed outside of TS times. It was hoped this discount would encourage works promoters to improve planning of activities to achieve first time permanent reinstatement, but this potential trend is not yet evident.
8  Authority Measures

In addition to DfT KPIs and HAUC TPIs, SCC has collated its own data.

8.1 AM 1 – Average duration of works by Permit type

Charts 28 and 29 Average duration of works by Works Type year 3

Average durations, when viewed by work type, remain broadly consistent with previous years data, with most noticeable changes being a slight decrease in Streetworks Major activities (from 34.6 days average in year 2) and a slight increase in WRP Major Activities (from 16.5 days average in year 2)
8.2 AM 2 – Inspections

These figures relate to Permit Compliance Inspections (PRM’s) and relate to the percentage of PRM’s undertaken where it has been found one or more Permit Conditions have been breached per Permitted works site.

Chart 30 shows that there has been a marginal decrease in the number of noncompliant sites inspected for Permit Conditions over both year 1 and year 2 figures. (15.6% and 16.6% respectively). This is encouraging however any non compliance in this area remains disappointing. Conditions are attached to Permits for the purpose of improved network management, for the benefit of highway users and permits are granted on this basis. Non compliance can result in increased disruption for the travelling public which the Permit Scheme is targeted to reduce.

Works promoters are encouraged to engage with the Authority regarding Conditions if they feel they are un-necessary or overly zealous for any specific activity. Those planning activities and making Permit Applications should do so on the basis that they intend to undertake works to those Conditions specified within the Permit. Activity Promoters should not proceed with works which they know prior to commencement, cannot comply with the conditions attached to the permit.

SCC hopes that the soon to be published HAUC Guidance Document on Permit Scheme Operation gives further clarification on the interpretation of National Condition Text, which may help decrease the percentage of sites failing to adhere to the permit conditions placed upon them.
The above chart has been added to this year’s report to indicate the amount of times over the year that specific Conditions have been seen to be not complied with. (Noting that with resources available, inspections can only be on a sample basis).

Breaches of NCT 08b “Manual Control of Traffic Signals” is a constant issue with the Authority view being that promoters may simply opt to receive a Fixed Penalty Notice, rather than comply with this Condition, which is specifically targeted at assisting traffic flows and hence the travelling public and which forms the basis on which the permit application is granted.

8.3 AM 3 – Days of Disruption Saved/ Number of Collaborative works

SCC actively supports and encourages collaborative working and encourages works promoters to complete works in the shortest reasonable duration to comply with the authorities Network Management Duties. In practice works promoters often show a degree of reluctance to accommodate collaborative working citing concerns over CDM regulations and Health and Safety practice.
The current system of reporting on collaborative working requires the works promoter to identify this on the Permit Application (not a mandatory EToN field), without this correct identification it is not possible to accurately report on this subject and consequently it is not reported here.

As stated previously in the report, the current EToN system used by SCC has no facility to record where durations have been reduced as a result of communication between the Authority and works promoter and consequently not reported here.

8.4 AM4 Fixed Penalty Notices

The software system employed by SCC to manage road works activities has no direct reporting facility when running reports on Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) that differentiates between FPNs issued against Permit Condition Breaches, Working Without a Permit and system generated FPNs. (Late Notice submissions). The following information is therefore derived from an alternative manual sort of data.

![Bar Chart showing FPNs issued against working without a Permit against promoter in Year 3](image)

Chart 32 showing FPNs issued against working without a Permit against promoter in Year 3

The figures above show when a works promoter is found to be working without a Permit. SCC has not to date elected to follow the route of prosecution for this offence, thus far issuing Fixed Penalty Notices to enable liability to be discharged.
This measure forms a key contractual KPI for Surrey’s own contractors and the Surrey Street Works team has been working closely with internal works promoters on the requirements for Permits in order to reduce “Working without a Permit” going forward. Whilst targeted to be zero, this year’s figure of 9 for WRP compares favorably with 38 recorded for the previous year. Other Promoters figures are broadly in line with previous years and whilst a zero target is the aim, the figures are encouragingly low.

In year 3 of Scheme operation, an amount of £11,740 was generated from Fixed Penalty Notices issued for Working without a Permit.

![Chart 33 showing FPNs issued against Breach of Permit Conditions against promoter in Year 3](image)

Conditions attached to Permits and agreed by works promoters are designed to assist with meeting Scheme objectives. Breaches of Permit Conditions generating FPNs remain disappointingly high and whilst year 3 figures represent a small decrease on year 2 figures, over half of this decrease is accounted for on SCC WRP alone, achieved with considerable effort by the current Term Contractor to ensure compliance.

In year 3 of Scheme operation, income of £68,440 was generated from FPNs issued for Breaches of Permit Conditions.
Volumes of Deemed Permit show a further reduction year on year of Scheme operation. The very low values shown in Chart 33 illustrates the need for Surrey CC Network Coordinators to scrutinise the impact of all activities on all of Surrey’s road network in order to meet both the residents and elected Members’ aspiration for Surrey Officers to be able to provide assurance that each and every activity affecting them and their communities is being undertaken in the most timely, safe and least disruptive way.
9 CONCLUSION

The strategic objectives for the Permit Scheme are taken from the council’s Strategic Transport Plan, namely;

‘To help people to meet their transport and travel needs effectively, reliably, safely and sustainably within Surrey; in order to promote economic vibrancy, protect and enhance the environment and improve the quality of life.’

The aim of the Permit Scheme was to improve the management of the road network through better planning, scheduling and management of activities so as not to cause avoidable traffic disruption to any highway user.

Areas of concern still remain, most notably disappointing adherence to Permit Conditions. These are specifically considered on a job-by-job case, and form the basis on which the permit application is granted. This means that non adherence may be unfavorably affecting the level of impact the activity has on residents and traffic flows. Surrey Officers continue to work closely with Works Promoters – both Statutory Undertakers and our own internal colleagues, to look to improve this compliance measure.

SCC hopes that the soon to be published HAUC Guidance Document on Permit Scheme Operation gives further clarification on the interpretation of National Condition Text, which may help decrease the percentage of sites failing to adhere to the permit conditions placed upon them.

Surrey Officers will continue to work with all stakeholders to promote opportunities for collaborative working and the accurate recording of such collaboration. SCC will also continue to encourage shorter durations of works where traffic flows are adversely affected. It is the view of Surrey Officers that significant inefficiencies remain within the industry slowing down works and adversely affecting the highway user, such as activities where there is a handover between specialist teams for different elements of an activity, resulting in work sites left unoccupied for a day or longer.

Surrey will continue to incentivise works promoters to plan their activities better by offering discounted Permit fees for working in collaboration with others, and for working wholly outside of traffic sensitive times.
General compliance to the overarching principle of Scheme operation remains high with very low volumes of works found to be being undertaken without a valid Permit. A considerable improvement can be seen by the volumes of WRP activities now being Permitted. This was far less visible under the previous noticing regime, which made coordination of these and parity of approach across all works promoters more difficult to achieve.

Whilst volumes of initial Permit Applications are down year on year and highway occupancy is slightly reduced year on year, Variations by works promoters on applications (changes once the application has been submitted) are still increasing. This is seen as a disappointing trend, perhaps indicating a lack of detail planning of the execution of the activity, prior to Permit Application.

In line with “Part 6 – Fees” of the ‘Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes’, with the financial figures published in this report, Surrey County Council will now consider a review of Team Structure/Permit fee levels in order to ensure that operation of the scheme remains financially cost neutral over the long term. Any such proposed changes to permit fee levels will be subject to the appropriate consultation.

END
Glossary

**Cat 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4** – Street categorisation as defined in the NRSWA in relation to volume of usage

**Deemed** - An application is deemed if a Permit response has not been issued within the required timeframe.

**DfT** - Department for Transport

**EDG** – EToN Developers Group

**Elgin** - is the creator of roadworks.org – the local and national communications hub for live and planned roadworks, road closures and traffic disruptions.

**EToN system** – The Electronic Transfer of Notices, the nationally agreed format for the transmission of notice information.

**FPN** – Fixed Penalty Notice. (Issued for identification of breach of Permit Conditions or working without a Permit)

**Granted** – A Permit application is granted by issuing the appropriate grant notification within the required timeframe.

**HAUC** – Highway Authorities and Utilities Committee

**Immediate Works (Emergency / Urgent)** – Works type as defined in the NRSWA

**Minor Works** - Works type as defined in the NRSWA

**KPI** – Key Performance Indicator as developed by the DfT and set out in the Permit Code of Practice

**Major Works** – Works type as defined in the NRSWA

**NCT** – National Condition Text. National Permit Conditions issued by the DfT England used from 01/07/2015 and mandatory from October 2015

**NMD** – Network Management Duty, a legal obligation created by the Traffic Management Act 2004 for highway authorities to secure the expeditious movement of traffic

**NRSWA** – New Roads and Street Works Act 1991

**NRC** - National Refusal Codes being developed by HAUC England, currently draft. Their use was adopted by ESCC from 01/07/2015 in line with NCT Conditions

**PA** – Permit Application. This term is used to define a Permit Application or any of the Permit variation applications.

**Refused** - An application is refused by issuing a refuse notification within the required timeframe.

**Standard Works** - Works type as defined in the NRSWA between 4 and 10 days duration

**PAA** - Provisional Advance Authorization.
PMR – Permit Condition Inspection

SEPS – South East Permit Scheme

SCC – Surrey County Council (Highway / Permit Authority)

SW – Street Works, as defined in section 48 of NRSWA

TMA – Traffic Management Act 2004

TPI – The TMA Performance Indicators (TPI’s) are a collection of measures for Works Promoters in the Streetworks Industry designed by HAUC UK and EDG members

TS - Traffic Sensitive. Any Street which is categorized as Traffic Sensitive under criteria included in the NRSWA

WRP – Works for Road Purposes as defined in section 86 of NRSWA
Surrey Rate Card

Baseline rates

Gross employee costs including employer's national insurance, superannuation and a contribution to the pension deficit. Costs for each grade taken from the penultimate point on scale, based on an analysis of historic employee grades and pay points.

Includes an allowance for marginal employee costs such as blackberrys, stationery, expenses and costs of raising sales invoices to third parties.

Mid rates

Includes all costs from the baseline, plus employee driven corporate support costs such as office accommodation, IT, HR, training and insurance. Also includes corporate overhead costs such as Finance, Procurement, Democratic Services, Policy and Performance. It is recommended that at least this rate is used for most situations.

Maximum rates

Includes all costs as per Mid rates, plus an allowance for manager's time. Assumes typical employee managed by someone two grades above and that each manager, manages six employees. These rates are recommended when scarce resources are used and could even be higher if expensive backfill is required to fill an employee's substantive role.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>L1 £ 1,040.00</th>
<th>L2 £ 1,154.00</th>
<th>L3 £ 1,268.00</th>
<th>L4 £ 1,382.00</th>
<th>L5 £ 1,496.00</th>
<th>L6 £ 1,608.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage Time Allocation</th>
<th>Cost to Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network Coordinator</td>
<td>sp6</td>
<td>£ 2,080.00</td>
<td>£ 2,308.00</td>
<td>£ 2,536.00</td>
<td>£ 2,764.00</td>
<td>£ 2,992.00</td>
<td>£ 3,220.00</td>
<td>£ 6,580.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>£ 6,557.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Coordinator</td>
<td>sp6</td>
<td>£ 2,080.00</td>
<td>£ 2,308.00</td>
<td>£ 2,536.00</td>
<td>£ 2,764.00</td>
<td>£ 2,992.00</td>
<td>£ 3,220.00</td>
<td>£ 6,580.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>£ 6,557.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Network Coor.</td>
<td>sp7</td>
<td>£ 1,560.00</td>
<td>£ 1,788.00</td>
<td>£ 2,016.00</td>
<td>£ 2,244.00</td>
<td>£ 2,472.00</td>
<td>£ 2,698.00</td>
<td>£ 4,944.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>£ 4,944.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Network Coor.</td>
<td>sp7</td>
<td>£ 1,560.00</td>
<td>£ 1,788.00</td>
<td>£ 2,016.00</td>
<td>£ 2,244.00</td>
<td>£ 2,472.00</td>
<td>£ 2,698.00</td>
<td>£ 4,944.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>£ 4,944.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Coordinator</td>
<td>sp8</td>
<td>£ 1,268.00</td>
<td>£ 1,488.00</td>
<td>£ 1,708.00</td>
<td>£ 1,928.00</td>
<td>£ 2,148.00</td>
<td>£ 2,368.00</td>
<td>£ 4,736.00</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>£ 116,613.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Coordinator</td>
<td>sp8</td>
<td>£ 1,268.00</td>
<td>£ 1,488.00</td>
<td>£ 1,708.00</td>
<td>£ 1,928.00</td>
<td>£ 2,148.00</td>
<td>£ 2,368.00</td>
<td>£ 4,736.00</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>£ 116,613.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Coordinator</td>
<td>sp8</td>
<td>£ 1,268.00</td>
<td>£ 1,488.00</td>
<td>£ 1,708.00</td>
<td>£ 1,928.00</td>
<td>£ 2,148.00</td>
<td>£ 2,368.00</td>
<td>£ 4,736.00</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>£ 116,613.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Works Officer</td>
<td>sp8</td>
<td>£ 1,268.00</td>
<td>£ 1,488.00</td>
<td>£ 1,708.00</td>
<td>£ 1,928.00</td>
<td>£ 2,148.00</td>
<td>£ 2,368.00</td>
<td>£ 4,736.00</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>£ 116,613.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Works Officer</td>
<td>sp8</td>
<td>£ 1,268.00</td>
<td>£ 1,488.00</td>
<td>£ 1,708.00</td>
<td>£ 1,928.00</td>
<td>£ 2,148.00</td>
<td>£ 2,368.00</td>
<td>£ 4,736.00</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>£ 116,613.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Works Officer</td>
<td>sp8</td>
<td>£ 1,268.00</td>
<td>£ 1,488.00</td>
<td>£ 1,708.00</td>
<td>£ 1,928.00</td>
<td>£ 2,148.00</td>
<td>£ 2,368.00</td>
<td>£ 4,736.00</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>£ 116,613.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Support Off.</td>
<td>sp7</td>
<td>£ 1,560.00</td>
<td>£ 1,788.00</td>
<td>£ 2,016.00</td>
<td>£ 2,244.00</td>
<td>£ 2,472.00</td>
<td>£ 2,698.00</td>
<td>£ 4,944.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>£ 163,224.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Support Off.</td>
<td>sp7</td>
<td>£ 1,560.00</td>
<td>£ 1,788.00</td>
<td>£ 2,016.00</td>
<td>£ 2,244.00</td>
<td>£ 2,472.00</td>
<td>£ 2,698.00</td>
<td>£ 4,944.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>£ 163,224.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Technical Supp.</td>
<td>sp9</td>
<td>£ 1,960.00</td>
<td>£ 2,186.00</td>
<td>£ 2,412.00</td>
<td>£ 2,638.00</td>
<td>£ 2,864.00</td>
<td>£ 3,090.00</td>
<td>£ 6,180.00</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>£ 61,572.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.5 The income from fees must not exceed the total allowable costs prescribed in the Permit regulations. This balance can be achieved over several years. Allowable costs are limited to: the proportion of direct costs and overheads attributable to operating the Scheme for undertakers, which are over and above the cost of the authority’s co-ordination duty under NRSWA. This may include the costs related to Permits which may not always lead to a Permit being granted. Overheads can include: non-salary staff-related costs such as pensions and benefits, proportionate allocation of accommodation, central services and IT costs, as well as general administration and management for monitoring the Permit system, KPIs and invoicing.

6.6 In the event that fees and costs do not match the actual outturn for any year adjustments should be considered. Transparent information on this should be provided to all stakeholders as part of the published evaluation of the Scheme. It is essential that, at least over a three year period fees do not exceed the allowable costs, also that fees must not exceed the proportion of costs for operating the Permit Scheme incurred in relation to statutory undertakers.

6.7 Regulations must be complied with and due regard must be given to this statutory guidance when developing a Scheme’s fee structure and considering which costs can be included.
Street Works Performance Indicators.

**PPI101 - PAA Applications**
A count of PAA Application (Major) Notification Types issued within the quarter. If a works phase has more than one PAA Application then each application will contribute separately towards the count.

**PPI102 - PAA Applications Granted**
A count of PAA Applications from PPI101 that were granted. A granted application will appear in this report if the application was made within the quarter (i.e. it appears in PPI101). This allows the two indicators to be meaningfully related to each other. For the official quarterly reports, this is made possible because the maximum allowed response time for a Permit Application is 1 calendar month, and the report snap-shot is 6 weeks after the period end. Whilst this introduces delay in production of the performance reports, it does make the overall suite more meaningful and avoids the situation (which can validly happen) where more PAA Applications are granted or deemed than are submitted. However, this means that the indicator will not be correct until one calendar month after the end of the period, and monthly reports produced only days after the end of a month may prove misleading.

**PPI103 - PAA Applications Deemed**
A count of PAA applications from PPI101 that became deemed. This is the number of PAA Applications from PPI101 where no corresponding GRANT PAA or REFUSE PAA exists before the required date. Superseded applications will not be included. This indicator is subject to the same timing implications for quarterly and monthly as PPI102.

**PPI104 - Initial Permit Applications**
A count of Works Phases that have their first Permit Application within the quarter. This includes Permit applications for Major works. It does not include PAA Applications. The issued date of the initial Permit application must fall within the quarter. This indicator counts only the first Permit application for each works phase.

**PPI105 - Initial Permit Applications Granted on First Submission**
A count of Works Phases from PPI104 where the notification has become granted or deemed. A granted application will appear in this report if the application from PPI104 was issued within the quarter. This is possible because the maximum allowed response time for a Permit Application is 5 days and therefore the response will be received before the results are finalised. This indicator (using PPI104 as a base) can be broadly used to determine the level (or percentage) of first-time approvals for the Permit Scheme.

**PPI106 - Permit Applications/Variations**
A count of all applications. This will exclude PAA Applications, but include Permit Applications (both initial applications and revised/modified applications) and all other types of Permit variation. The date criterion used for this indicator is the issued date of the application. This indicator is not provided as a standalone meaningful indicator. Rather it is provided as base figure to be available as a denominator for other indicators.
**PPI107 – Permit Applications Deemed**
A count of applications from PPI106 that are deemed, i.e. there has been no grant, refusal or Permit modification request issued by the Permit authority within the prescribed response period. Because this indicator relates to applications counted in PPI106, it can be used to derive the level (or percentage) of applications that become deemed.

**PPI108 – Permit Applications Granted**
A count of applications from PPI106 for which a Permit grant was issued by the Permit authority. Because this indicator relates to applications counted in PPI106, it can be used to derive the level (or percentage) of applications that are granted.

**PPI109 – Permit Application Refused**
A count of applications from PPI106 that are refused by the Permit authority. Because this indicator relates to applications counted in PPI106, it can be used to derive the level (or percentage) of applications that are refused.

**PPI110 – Permit Applications Modifications Requested**
A count of applications from PPI106 for which a Permit Modification Request was issued by the Permit authority. Because this indicator relates to applications counted in PPI106, it can be used to derive the level (or percentage) of applications subject to a modification request.

**PPI111 – Permit Phases Cancelled Before Granted/Deemed**
This indicator measures the number of applications from PPI106 that the promoter cancelled before they were granted or deemed. Works phases of Major Works that have only progressed as far as the PAA stage, and not yet had a full Permit application are not therefore included, but they would be included if a follow-up application has been submitted and not yet granted/deemed.
The data criterion used for this indicator is the issued date of the application.
Note: A cancelled phase will count only once towards this report – regardless of the number of “superseded” or “due” applications.

**PPI112 – Granted/Deemed Works Phases Never Started**
This indicator measures the number of granted/deemed works phases that are either (i) cancelled (“good practice”); or (ii) were not started within the Permitted period.
It will include:
(i) A count of all cancellation notices received after a works phase is granted/deemed.
(ii) A count of works for which no actual start notice has been received by the required date.

The criteria used for inclusion of a works phase in this indicator are either
(i) The notification date of the cancellation notice.
(ii) The latest date an Actual Start Notice would be required.

Because of the criteria for inclusion, the results in this indicator cannot be related directly to the number of granted/deemed applications counted in PPI107 and PPI108, i.e. the date the phase was cancelled could be in the quarter following the date of the grant/deem.
**PPI113 - Authority Imposed Variations/Revokes**
A count of Authority Imposed Variations and Revoke Permit notifications issued within the quarter.
Because of the criteria for inclusion, the results in this indicator cannot be related directly to the number of granted/deemed applications counted in PPI107 and PPI108, i.e. the date of the authority imposed variation or revoke could be in the quarter following the date of the grant/deem.

**PPI114 - Duration Variation Applications**
A count of Duration Variation Applications issued for works in progress within the quarter.

**PPI115 - Duration Variation Applications Refused**
A count of applications from PPI114 that are refused, or for which a modification request is issued. The data criterion used for this indicator is the issued date of the application. Because this indicator relates to applications counted in PPI114, it can be used to derive the level (or percentage) of duration variation applications that are accepted or declined.

**PPI116 - Works with Collaborative Working**
A count of the number of works phases started, with one of the following collaboration codes:
- TRENCH SHARING (PRIMARY)
- TRENCH SHARING (SECONDARY)
- OTHER COLLABORATION
The date criteria used for this indicator is the Actual Start Date of the Works Phase. This report will be available for Permit and non-Permit works.

**PPI122 - Permit Applications with Conditions**
This is a count of applications from PPI106 where one or more of the condition flags were set on that application. Because this indicator relates to applications counted in PPI106, it can be used to derive the level (or percentage) of applications that contain Conditions.

**PPI123 - Duration Challenges**
This is a count of the number of DURATION CHALLENGE notifications issued in the quarter. Because of the criteria for inclusion, i.e. the date of the Duration Challenge, the results in this indicator cannot be related directly to the number of granted/deemed applications counted in PPI107 and PPI108, i.e. the date of the duration challenge could be in the quarter following the date of the grant/deem. This report will be available for Permit and non-Permit works.

**PPI124 - Early Starts Without Agreements**
The number of works phases where the Actual Start Date is before the earliest allowed Start Date and there is no early start agreement in place for the works. The date criterion used for this indicator is the Actual Start Date. This report will be available for Permit and non-Permit works.
**PPI125 – Authority Permit Modification Request Response Time (minutes)**

This is the number of minutes that it takes for the authority to send a Permit modification request in response to an application. The issued date of the application will be used to determine whether the application is included in the quarter. Response times are measured in working minutes, i.e. the interval between the date and time the application was processed into the system and the date and time that the resulting Permit modification request was issued. This is measured in the number of minutes that fall between 08:00 and 16:30 on working days. Reported times may be zero minutes where a response occurs outside of working hours for an application that is received within the same out-of-hours period.

**PPI126 - Promoter Permit Modification Request Response Time (minutes)**

This is the number of minutes that it takes for the promoter to send an application in response to a Permit modification request. The issued date of the response application will be used to determine whether the application is included in the quarter. Response times are measured in working minutes, i.e. the interval between date and time that the Permit modification request was issued and the date and time that the resulting modified application was issued. If more than one Permit modification request has been issued in response to an application, the first modification request is used for this indicator. This is measured in the number of minutes that fall between 08:00 and 16:30 on working days. Reported times may be zero minutes where an application response occurs outside of working hours for a Permit modification request that is received within the same out-of-hours period.
The TMA Performance Indicators (TPI’s) are a collection of measures for Works Promoters in the Streetworks Industry designed by HAUC UK and EDG members. The TMA Performance Indicators to be included in the quarterly report come under the following:

**Occupancy of the Highway – Coordination – Inspection -Reinstatement - Safety**

**TPI 1 Works phase started.**

A count of all Works phases that started within a given quarter.

**TPI 2 Works phases completed**

A count of all work phases completed within a given quarter.

**TPI 3 Days of Occupancy**

A count of all Works occupancy days for any Works phases that were active (in progress) at any time within a given quarter, only days within the quarter will be counted. Days to be counted will be between the actual start date on the “Actual Start” notice (or the New Activity notice for immediate Works) and the Actual End Date on the “Works Stop” notice, Inclusive of both Start and End dates. As above, if a Works Status Correction has been used to revert an Actual Start or Works Stop notice, the preceding Start / Stop notice will be ignored and the date from a subsequent Start / Stop notice used instead.

**TPI 4 Average duration of completed Work phases**

The average duration in days for all those Work phases that were completed within the quarter, i.e. for the works that are included within TPI 2, this will be calculated as the “Aggregated Duration for all TPI 2 Works Phases” / TPI 2 Count of number of Works Phases” where the Duration is the number of days from the Actual Start Date to the Actual End Date, inclusive. The Average Duration will be rounded up to the nearest two decimal places.

**TPI 5 Works of Phases completed after the Reasonable Period**

Works phases where the Works Stop Date was after the “Reasonable Period” for the phase. The end of the Reasonable Period is identified by the Estimated End Date in the latest promoter notice, unless that has been superseded by a subsequent Duration Challenge from the authority which takes precedence whether or not there has been a Duration Challenge Non-Acceptance from the promoter.

**TPI 6 Overrun days**

A sum of the total overrun days for those work phases that were completed during the quarter. An accumulation of the number of days from the end of the Reasonable Period to the Actual End Date, including any overrun days that may be in the previous quarters.
**TPI 7 Number of Phase 1 Registrations**

**TPI 8 Number of Phase 1 Permanent Registrations**

The count of works where all sites on the Full Registration notice for the works phase has one of the following

a. Permanent

b. Bar Hole

This count would exclude works where any notice referring to an additional phase has been recorded before a Full Registration notice was received. This would result in the appropriate exclusion of any works where immediate Remedial Works was found to be necessary.

**Co-ordination of Works**

**TPI 9 Incorrectly Timed Notices**

This indicator is the number of notices that do not comply with the legislative requirements on timing. It should be noted that this does not mean that every one of these situations could have resulted in the issue of a valid FPN (A New Activity Notice sent with insufficient notice period can only validly become a FPN if the work is actually started early without an agreement)

This indicator is therefore based on the only area in which an automatic judgement can be made, whether notices were sent in accordance with the defined rules on time frame. By providing a measure of the incorrectly timed notices, it is the best that can be done to give an indication of the likely number of notices that could result in a FPN

Notices to be investigated will only be those issued by the promoters of Works, Notices issued by authorities will not be included.

Early Starts and Extension to Validity Period have to be taken into account so that the associated notices are not included in the count

**TPI 10 Fixed Penalty Notices given**

The number of Fixed Penalty Notices issued whether sent electronically via EtoN, Fax, Post or E-Mail. The issue date of the FPN will be determine whether the FPN is included in the quarter.

It is anticipated that data for this indicator will only be available for utilities and the report will not generally be provided for authority promoters.

**TPI 11 Fixed Penalty Notices paid**

The number of FPN's that were paid in the quarter. Many authorities Notice Management systems are unable to provide this information, in these cases no data will be reported for this indicator.
**TPI 12 Fixed Penalty Notices withdrawn**

The number of FPN's issued but subsequently withdrawn

**TPI 13 Early start agreements**

All works phases with an “Early Start” that has been agreed with the Street works Team

**Inspection**

The sample inspections function works on an “inspection year” basis and there is a degree of freedom for authorities to vary the statutory inspections that are carried out in the different quarters of the year. These indicators will only provide a completely meaningful picture following the end of the inspection year

It is good practice to have a reasonably consistent rate of inspections carried out throughout the year and therefore these indicators will be submitted each quarter providing an “inspection year to date” analysis as at the end of a quarter,

As statutory sample inspections only apply to utility works it is expected that these indicators will only be provided for utility works promoters

**TPI 14 Agreed sample inspections**

The agreed level of Sample inspections for Categories A,B and C for the year to date based on the assumption of a consistent rate of inspections throughout the year.

**TPI 15 Sample Inspections Recorded as Chargeable**

The total of all “Sample” Category A,B and C inspections for the year to date that have been recorded as inspections that could be charged for (have been recorded as carried out up to the end of the relevant quarter and not marked as abortive) Inspections are included based on the date the inspection was carried out not the date recorded if this is different.

**Reinstatement of Works**

**TPI 16 Sample Category B & C inspections**

Sample inspections that have been carried out in the year to date and up to the end of the quarter that is being reported. Inspections are included based on the date the inspection was carried out not the date at which it was recorded if this is different. This does not include any sample inspections that were selected but subsequently cancelled, recorded as not having been carried out.

**TPI 17 Sample Category B & C failures**

This is based on an analysis of the inspections included in the above that has been recorded as a failure

If the inspection outcome has been amended since the original entry; i.e. a new version of the result has been recorded, only the latest version will be counted. If there is a joint inspection site visit following the inspection the results of this will not be taken into account, unless the original inspection has been amended accordingly with a new version
Safety at Works

**TPI 18 Sample Category A inspections**

Cat A Sample Inspections that have been carried out up to the end of the quarter. This does not include any sample inspections that were selected but subsequently cancelled, recorded as not having been carried out.

**TPI 19 Sample Category A failures**

Cat A Sample inspections carried out that the outcome has been recorded as a failure.

If the inspection outcome has been amended since the original entry, i.e. a new version has been recorded, only the details in the latest version will be counted.
## Minor Promoter List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promoter Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSkyB Telecommunications Services Ltd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABLE AND WIRELESS UK [70]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLT TELECOMMUNICATIONS [7075]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept for Transport Stat Roads [7188]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES Pipelines Ltd [7260]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP Electricity Ltd [7309]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSO [7091]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUNETWORKS FIBER UK LTD [7307]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulcrum Pipelines Limited [7294]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAS TRANSPORTATION CO LTD [7231]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL CROSSING [7183]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Next Generation Networks Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Pipelines Limited [7218]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Power Networks Ltd [7281]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Communications (CSO) [7082]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON TRANSPORT [7210]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Grid Electric PLC [7015]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETWORK RAIL -PROMOTERS NATIONAL [7093]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange PCS Group [7233]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romec [7221]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Water [9104]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSE Telecommunications Limited [7244]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telefonica (O2 (UK) Limited) [7182]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THUS [7224]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Mobile (UK) Limited [7250]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verizon Business Ltd [7086]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>