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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, make 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 2nd year in Surrey County Council and provides detailed scrutiny of the available data in relation to both Street Works and Works for Road Purposes activities in Surrey for this period. The report also where relevant refers to data reported from the first year of Scheme operation.

With the fee structure set at the outset of the Scheme, the second year of operation generated an invoiced amount of £993,546.56. This compares with an invoiced amount of £942,205.52 during the first year of operation, noting that no fees were charged during the first month of operation in the first year of the Scheme. Scheme costs are detailed in the main body of the report.

All base data used in the report, except where identified, is taken from the EToN compliant Symology Insight system used by SCC to manage street works activities.

With only two years of Scheme operation it is not possible as yet to identify any specific trends, however one major benefit can be seen in the large volumes of ‘Works for Road Purposes’ (activities undertaken by the Highway Authority) now being subject to Permits, against the initially predicted low quantity of such activities prior to Scheme commencement, which were based on historic EToN System evidence. This greatly improved visibility of SCC’s own activities on the Highway Network allows for a more 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 itself.

Operation of the Permit Scheme has been extremely advantageous for 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 several large, high profile events which have taken place in Surrey during 2015; Magna Carta 800 celebrations at Runnymede, National Armed Forces
Day in Guildford Town Centre and supporting Highways England, Transport for London and the London Borough of Richmond in managing both road closures and the surrounding road networks for all Rugby World Cup Matches at Twickenham Stadium.

The information contained within this report illustrates the Scheme is being operated successfully and the necessary parity of approach is adopted. Since commencement in November 2013, operation of the Scheme has been amended in line with changes to legislation as required, such as use of National Permit Conditions and Permit fee discounts for works completed outside of traffic sensitive times.

Over the two years of Scheme operation, income from Permit fees has not adequately covered the additional costs borne by SCC, with a total shortfall of £222,476 across the two years. This is set out in detail within this report (table 4, page 23). As such the Authority may now consider a review of Permit fee levels. Any such changes will be subject to a full formal consultation.

SCC is currently undertaking a review of the Traffic Sensitive Streets designation within its Street Gazetteer which will also be formally consulted upon. No changes to Permit fees will be proposed until this exercise is completed and any changes to traffic sensitivity designations – and subsequent anticipated Permit fee income levels, are fully analysed.

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.

Covering 1,600 square kilometers, Surrey is the second smallest shire county in the South East, representing 8.7% of the total South East area but accounts for 13% of its population at just over 1.1million making Surrey the most densely populated and third most populated county in the region. 817,272 of the population are economically active (2011). Surrey’s largest towns are Guildford and Woking. 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.

Surrey is home to 61,900 businesses (2011) and has a Gross Value Added (GVA) worth of £32.7 billion in 2012. Surrey is the largest sub-regional economy in the South East generating more GVA than Birmingham, Leeds, and Liverpool. Surrey has the highest Gross Domestic Product per capita of any county in the UK. Surrey contributes more in personal income tax revenue to the Exchequer than any other area, excluding London.

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.

The County Council has responsibility for 3,000 miles of road network, with Highways England having responsibility for the County’s Motorways and all-purpose trunk roads. Many of Surrey’s roads form the 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 66% 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 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 Local Transport Plan has a stated objective of helping people 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.

Figures supplied by Elgin from the www.roadworks.org website show that public interest in road works in Surrey is the highest in the South East with 465,213 enquiries made in the 2014/15 year compared to Kent with 342,126 enquiries and Hampshire with 287,510 enquiries. This emphasises the need to employ a robust system, such as the South East Permit Scheme, to effectively manage the Surrey highway network.
The South East Permit Scheme (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.

As part of SEPS, SCC plays an active role in the Statutory Undertakers Liaison Forum established to provide governance to the standard application of SEPS and to provide Statutory Undertakers with an opportunity to input into the running of the Scheme.

During the first year of operation, the ‘EToN’ platform used by the industry for communication purposes (Electronic Transfer of Notices), upgraded from version 5 to version 6. Along with the existing ability to Grant or Refuse a Permit application, the change introduced the Permit Modification Request (PMR) feature which enabled comment to be made as to what adjustments were needed in order for the Permit application to be granted, without the necessity to actually Refuse an application.

During this second year of operation, Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes was issued by the Department for Transport and came into effect on the 1st of October 2015. This guidance introduced both the mandatory requirement for Permit Authorities to make available a Permit fee discount to works promoters who carried out their works on traffic sensitive roads wholly outside of traffic sensitive times and also the requirement to use the national set of Permit Conditions.

Focus during the second operating year has been on embedding the principles of the Permit Scheme. A major challenge came in the form of the new National Permit Conditions which SCC chose to voluntarily adopt significantly ahead of the 1st October deadline when usage become statutory. With these Conditions still requiring further clarification on interpretation, resulting in differences in application across Highway Authorities, work continues internally and also across the Street works industry to understand and agree the use of these Conditions, to best serve Surrey’s Network Management Duty under the TMA.

Due to system limitations, data runs for performance statistics are taken from 1st of November through to the 31st of October each year, as opposed to the Scheme introduction date of the 11th 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 therefore 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 more efficiently to secure the expeditious movement of traffic. We recognise that the long-term solution is more efficient use of our network, with the introduction and operation of the Permit Scheme contributing to this objective.

The strategic objectives for the Permit Scheme are taken from the council’s Local 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 the 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 will enable 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 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 report and anecdotal evidence from Surrey’s Officers, Statutory Undertakers and other Stakeholders, demonstrate that the Permit Scheme is meeting all the objectives set out above, specific examples are;

- Through proactive use of Permit Modification Requests (PRM’s) and Permit Conditions SCC has been able to coordinate activities to a far greater extent than previously resulting in more efficient use of road space and helping 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, has 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.
• 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 use of the Elgin Comms App to improve online content of roadworks information and the volume of public use of roadworks.org 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 dropped significantly since the commencement of the Permit Scheme.

• Use of PMRs and Permit Conditions, along with an increase in the level of on-site inspections brought about by operation of the Permit Scheme, help ensure that specific provisions for people with a disability, and other bespoke considerations on local communities can be better identified and mitigated.

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

• 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 two years.

• 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.
4. Fee Structure

Income (Second Year of Scheme Operation)

The fee structure set at the outset of the Scheme, for the year 11\textsuperscript{th} November 2014 through to 10\textsuperscript{th} November 2015 has generated an invoiced amount of £993,546.56

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Main Roads</th>
<th>Minor Roads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Advanced Authorisation</td>
<td>£83</td>
<td>£66</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 2

The following series of graphs, (only available for the second year of operation of the Scheme due to developments with internal recording systems over the initial operational year), show the invoiced amount breakdown against Permit and street category.

Permit Advanced Authorisation

**Charts 1, 2 and 3 Permit Advanced Authorisation**

Total amount invoiced for Permit Advanced Authorizations **£66,794.50**

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

Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Major Works £143,077.60
Permit Application – Standard Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Standard Works **£112,118.46**

Permit Application – Minor Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Minor Works **£346,138.20**
Permit Applications – Immediate (Emergency) Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Immediate (Emergency) Works £44,200

Permit Applications – Immediate (Urgent) Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Immediate (Urgent) Works £107,737.80
Permit Variations – Major Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Major Works £23,235.50
Permit Variations – Standard Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Standard Works **£38,862.50**

Permit Variations – Minor Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Minor Works **£66,232.00**
Permit Variations – Immediate (Emergency) Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Immediate (Emergency) Works £27,595.00

Permit Variations – Immediate (Urgent) Works

Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Immediate (Urgent) Works £17,535.00
Total amount invoiced for Permit Advanced Authorizations | £66,794.50
Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Major Works | £143,077.60
Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Standard Works | £112,118.46
Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Minor Works | £346,138.20
Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Immediate (Emergency) Works | £44,200
Total amount invoiced for Permit Applications for Immediate (Urgent) Works | £107,737.80
Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Major Works | £23,235.50
Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Standard Works | £38,862.50
Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Minor Works | £66,232.00
Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Immediate (Emergency) Works | £27,595.00
Total amount invoiced for Permit Variations for Immediate (Urgent) Works | £17,535.00

Total £993,526.56

Table 1 Permit Income Year 2

5 Costs and Benefits

Costs

At commencement of the Surrey Permit Scheme, a total of 18 additional posts were identified as required over and above the level required to operate the previous Noticing regime. One of these positions (Assistant Technical Support Officer) has now been deleted.

Salaries quoted are standard SCC rechargeable costs at Mid Rate on the SCC Rate Card. This is in line with Section 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, with any rate revision being effective from the 1st of April each year. Consequently with a Scheme start date in mid November, calculations of staff costs include a ‘mid year’ rate change in the relevant Permit year.
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 were occupied at the commencement of the
Scheme, some occupied prior to Scheme commencement and recruitment to cover staff
leaving has not always been contiguous. Appendix 2 details

A Permit Scheme allows the Authority to recoup a proportion of these additional staff costs
reflective of that attributable to utility company works only, i.e. any additional costs for
staff, software, offices, equipment, etc. The additional costs in operating a Permit Scheme
associated to the County Councils own highway works cannot be recovered.

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, however a reasonable, logical rationale has been used to apportion staff time
between differing activity types, on a post-by-post basis.

Time allocation for the Network Coordinator posts within the Surrey Street Works structure
have been apportioned at 75/25 on the basis of the figures in Chart 26 with an adjustment
to accommodate the closer working relationship possible with internal works promoters
which results in a shorter scrutiny of applications necessary, plus there is a higher visibility
of internal forward programmes at an early stage, enabling Street Works department input
and direction, resulting in less input at the Permit approval stage.

The post of Network Coordination Administrator was created to deal with Street Works
issues related to Permits and as such 100% of time is assigned to Permit costs.

Street Works Officers (SWO’s) are essentially inspectors of Street Works and have a
proportion of time allocated to inspecting Works for Road Purposes (WRP) for Permit
Condition Compliance and on a percentage of WRP sites, Signing Lighting and Guarding to
meet internal contractual KPI’s. (Inspection of the quality of WRP is undertaken by other
Surrey Highway Officers, whose costs are not included within the Permit Scheme operation
as these officers sit outside of Surrey’s Streetworks team). Time allocation for SWO’s has
been apportioned 85/15 Streetworks/WRP.
The post of Senior Technical Support Officer was created to provide a management function over the new financial aspects associated with the Permit Scheme, with a portion of time allocated to managing existing staff. An 80/20 split has been apportioned for this role.

Two additional Assistant Technical Support Officer roles were created to support the operation of the Permit Scheme. This role has subsequently been reduced to a single post which has a zero charge to the Permit Scheme.

Two Technical Support Officers were recruited with the sole purpose of dealing on a day to day basis with the financial aspects associated with a Permit Scheme and as such 100% of their time has been apportioned to the Permit Scheme.
Cost Summary

First year costs

<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>£295,768.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Coordinator</td>
<td>sp8</td>
<td>£370,736.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Network Coordinator</td>
<td>sp7</td>
<td>£117,828.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Coordination Admin</td>
<td>sp6</td>
<td>£35,568.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Technical Support Officer</td>
<td>sp9</td>
<td>£80,784.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Support Officer</td>
<td>sp7</td>
<td>£157,104.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Technical Support Officer</td>
<td>sp6</td>
<td>£00.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Costs Year 1

£1,057,788.00

Second year costs

<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>£300,428.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Coordinator</td>
<td>sp8</td>
<td>£387,180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Network Coordinator</td>
<td>sp7</td>
<td>£98,712.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Coordination Admin</td>
<td>sp6</td>
<td>£72,252.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Technical Support Officer</td>
<td>sp9</td>
<td>£82,368.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Support Officer</td>
<td>sp7</td>
<td>£159,480.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Technical Support Officer</td>
<td>sp6</td>
<td>£00.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Costs Year 2

£1,100,420.00
Prior to any consideration of the potential to increase Permit fees to redress this imbalance in income verses permissible Scheme costs, SCC will consider anything else which may affect these calculations for year three of Scheme operation and beyond.

It is a requirement of Section 6.11 of the Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permits Schemes to offer a discounted fee for works on streets designated as traffic sensitive when the works are conducted wholly outside of the defined traffic sensitive times.

This Guidance was issued by the Department for Transport with a 1st October 2015 implementation date and consequently the discount prescribed did not form part of the SCC Permit Scheme Business Case constructed prior to the Scheme introduction in November 2013.

In line with the discount rate for collaborative working, SCC introduced a 30% reduction on fees for works on traffic sensitive streets conducted wholly outside of traffic sensitive times from the 1st October 2015. 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.

Whilst only applying to a small proportion of the timescale covered by this report, projections are that the annual invoiced amount for Permit fees will be reduced by circa £26,000 p.a. as a result of offering this discount to works promoters.
SCC is currently undertaking a review of the Traffic Sensitive Streets designation within its Street Gazetteer which will be formally consulted upon before any changes are made to designations. This exercise has not been undertaken in Surrey for a number of years and the scale/nature of recommended changes to Traffic Sensitive designations are not yet known. As such no changes to Permit fees will be proposed until this exercise is completed and any changes to traffic sensitivity designations – and subsequent anticipated Permit fee income levels, have been fully analysed.

If an increase in Permit fees is proposed, Surrey may seek to increase current fee levels, or may seek to make changes to the wording of the Scheme itself in order to introduce the potential to levy fees against activities currently stated as ‘zero charge’, such as minor activities on Non Traffic Sensitive streets.

Any proposed changes to Permit fee levels, post Traffic Sensitive Streets review, will need to remain within the maximum levels set by statute, as set out in the table below;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>£105</td>
<td>£77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Advanced Authorisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>£0</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 being explored for inclusion in future reports.

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.
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 first and second year of Scheme operation in Surrey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permits Received / Granted / Refused</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Permit Applications received by Surrey County Council: (Symology/PPI 104)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Applications (Permit and Variation) received by Surrey County Council: (Symology/PPI 106)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Permit Variation Applications received by Surrey County Council: (Calculation 106 - 104)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Applications with status that cannot be determined: (Permit phases Cancelled before Granted / Deemed) (Symology/PPI 111)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Applications Granted or Refused: (Calculation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Applications (Permit and Variation ) Granted: (Symology/PPI 108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Applications (Permit and Variation ) Refused: (Symology/PPI 109)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 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 for years one and two of Scheme operation. This is shown as a total and split WRP and Street Works.

Charts 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23 Permits Granted / Refused with Percentage Years 1 & 2
### Year 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emergency</th>
<th>Urgent</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td>11.63%</td>
<td>18.81%</td>
<td>7.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street works</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>10.56%</td>
<td>19.62%</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works for Road Purposes</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
<td>14.04%</td>
<td>11.64%</td>
<td>9.78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emergency</th>
<th>Urgent</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>21.65%</td>
<td>24.41%</td>
<td>10.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street works</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>20.82%</td>
<td>24.83%</td>
<td>10.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works for Road Purposes</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>23.58%</td>
<td>20.89%</td>
<td>11.96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Chart 24, Table 6 Percentage Refusals split works type for Year 1**

**Chart 25, Table 7 Percentage Refusals split works type for Year 2**
The following considerations must be noted in relation to this data.

1. Each application has an appropriate response period which means that the number of applications received in any one period does not 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.

The above issue means that there a number of Permit applications, the status of which cannot be determined.

**Number of Permit Applications**

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

In the first year of Scheme operation, works for road purposes generated 34% and street works 66% of the applications received compared to second year Scheme operation figures of 27% for works for road purposes and 73% for street works.

![Initial Permit Applications by Year](chart)

*Chart 26 Number of Permit Applications received for Street Works and Works for Road Purposes.*
6.1.2 Analysis

Permits Granted and Refused

The overall refusal rates (Charts 19 to 23) of Street Works and WRP of 7.58% and 8.04% to 2.20% and 2.93% respectively demonstrate the close working relationship which is possible between the Surrey Street Works department and internal works promoters. This also reflects use of Immediate (Urgent) Permits to undertake reactive works such as pot hole repairs where volumes of works are high and Permits can be submitted retrospectively and works may already be completed before Permit application content is scrutinised (due to the short duration of works) and Granted.

Reviewing Refusals by Category (Charts 24 and 25) it be seen that particularly in year two of Scheme operation, there is clear parity between Street Works and Works for Road Purposes. Whilst the percentage of Immediate works Refusals remains fairly consistent from the first to second year of Scheme operation, Refusals of planned works has increased, demonstrating an increased level of scrutiny by Network Coordinators as they become more familiar with the application of the Scheme.

Number of Permit Applications

There has been a decrease in the total number of Permit applications from year 1 to year 2, (shown in Chart 9). The volume of applications for Works for Road Purposes has reduced notably in the second year of the Permit Scheme. This can in part be attributed to internal works promoters becoming familiar with the requirements of a Permit Scheme and which works required a Permit.

Part of the reduction could also be attributed to the EToN PMR facility which was introduced in April 2015, enabling Permit applications to be Modified rather than Refused and a new Application made.

However with only two full years of data, it is too early to establish a trend in this respect.
The table below is taken from the Business Case document used to support the initial Permit Scheme submission. As can be seen the overall quantity used in estimation for Street Works is broadly in line with Chart 9, however the WRP figure is significantly lower.

This indicates that historically a considerable amount of our own work was being undertaken without clear visibility and parity of approach by those conducting Network Management functions and hence not being considered in the Duty of Network Management, prior to the commencement of the Permit Scheme.

Introduction of the Scheme has meant that such works are now more visible, easier to coordinate and are subject to the same considerations/restrictions/instructions as Statutory Undertakers works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Works Type</th>
<th>Street Works</th>
<th>Works for Road Purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0,1,2 &amp; TS</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAA &amp; Major</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>2197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>6413</td>
<td>19964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>3181</td>
<td>5572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>10871</td>
<td>28460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>39,331</td>
<td>2,549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 predicted works volumes from Business Case document
Note must be made that the information above, generated directly from the built-in reporting function in the Symology software is dependent on the works promoter correctly identifying the EToN Condition type when submitting the Permit application. SCC Street Works department have no influence on this data set.

Prior to 1 July 2015 SCC used Standard and Model Conditions that were specific to the South East Permit Scheme, from that date onwards the National Conditions have been in use. Hence it will not be until the Scheme third year report that clearer data will be available.
6.3 The Number of Approved Revised Durations.

Charts 11 & 12 show the number of Duration Variation applications received as a percentage of Works phases started for years one and two of the Scheme operation.

These Charts show that the gas industry makes the most duration variations. This is not entirely unexpected given the nature of this industry and would primarily be expected to be associated with Immediate works. Figures are broadly in line year on year and further data is required to comment on any trend.
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.
In line with the Network Management Duty as defined in section 16 of the TMA 2004, additional scrutiny has been applied in the second year of Scheme operation resulting in a higher number of Duration Variation Requests being declined whilst still Granting a significant percentage of all requests. It should be noted that all reasonable requests will be Granted where there are no other network coordination issues.

It should also be noted that not all agreements for 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 will 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).
Charts 31 and 32 Number of applications to reduce the notification period (Early Starts) as a percentage of total applications made

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) - 44,732 [First year 61,999]
7.2 TPI2 Works Phases Completed (Base Data) - 44,768 [First year 62,008]
7.3 TPI3 Days of Occupancy - 443,663 [First year 461,811]

(The EToN system used by SCC is unable to provide this information in full. Annual figures have been derived by extrapolation of three yearly quarters of data).
Charts 33 and 34 Number of days of highway occupancy Year 1 and Year 2

The figure supplied for days of occupancy must 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.

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 as 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 of Completed Works Phases - Year 1</th>
<th>Average Duration of Completed Works Phases - Year 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affinity Water</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td>14.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Water</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>90.80</td>
<td>31.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton &amp; East Surrey Water</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>85.42</td>
<td>125.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>10.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>44.49</td>
<td>42.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works promoter</td>
<td>Works type</td>
<td>Average Duration of Completed Works Phases - Year 1</td>
<td>Works promoter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Grid Gas</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>National Grid Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>31.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Gas Networks</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>Southern Gas Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>51.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Electric</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Southern Electric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Power Networks</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>UK Power Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works promoter</td>
<td>Works type</td>
<td>Average Duration of Completed Works Phases - Year 1</td>
<td>Works promoter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT Openreach</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>BT Openreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Media</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>Virgin Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey County Council</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>Surrey County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5 **TPI5 Phases Completed on time**  43,329 [First year 61,036]*

7.6 **TPI6 Number of deemed Permit applications**  5 [First year 41]

7.7 **TPI8 Number of Phase One Permanent Registrations**  16,237 [First year 13,644]**

* 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.
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 35 and 36 show that the average durations, when viewed by Permit type, are consistent from one year to the next with the exception of major works. This is not surprising given the unlimited and variable duration of this type of works and that works can be classified as ‘major’ for reasons other than duration. (i.e. the need for a TTRO)
8.2  AM 2 – Inspections

These figures relate to Permit compliance inspections carried out. A point of note is that only with the introduction of EToN 6 in April 2014 did the option of recording Permit Condition Compliance inspections under their own heading of a PRM inspection, hence figures for Year 1 of Scheme operation are from the period commencing May 2014.

The figures shown relate to the percentage of Permit Condition inspections undertaken where it has been found one or more Permit Conditions have been breached per Permitted works site.

![Failed Permit Condition Inspections as a Percentage of Inspections Undertaken]

Chart 37 Failed Permit Conditions Checks as % of all undertaken for first and second years of Permit Scheme

Chart 37 shows that there has been a marginal increase in the number of noncompliant sites inspected for Permit Conditions from the first year to the second year of the Permit Scheme.

Any non compliance in this area is disappointing. Conditions are attached to Permits for the purpose of improved network management, for the benefit of highway users. Non compliance can result in increased disruption for the travelling public which the Permit Scheme is targeted to reduce.

Works promoters have an opportunity to engage with those setting the Conditions if they feel they are un-necessary or overly zealous for any specific activity and those planning activities should do so on the basis that they intend to undertake works to those Conditions specified.
The increase in failed Permit condition inspections in year two operation is of concern and Surrey Officers will continue to monitor this trend and engage with all works promoters to ascertain why compliance levels are not improving as understanding of Scheme operation develops and improves year-on-year.

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, without this correct identification it is not possible to accurately report on this subject and consequently 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 authority and works promoter and consequently not reported here.

Collaboration has been possible on many occasions and has saved a great deal of disruption as illustrated below;

**Oxshott High Street**

The A244 is a significant artery in the Surrey highway network providing the link between the A3 and M25. Part of this road forms Oxshott High Street and is part of the RideLondon Surrey 100 Cycle Sportive course. To carry out essential gas mains replacement, it was necessary for the road to be completely closed to traffic. Conditions were imposed that meant the works were undertaken in the summer school holidays, utilising extended hours and vacating the road totally over the weekend of the RideLondon Surrey 100 event.

Whilst the road was under closure, works by BT Openreach, Virgin Media, UK Power Networks, Sutton and East Surrey Water and our own Integrated Transportation Scheme works were instructed to take place to make best use of the closure period.
Other Typical Examples

West Street Farnham; South East Water, Southern Gas Networks, Scottish and Southern Electric, supplying new services to a Development working under the same multi way portable light lights over the Easter school holidays.

Snowdenham Lane; Thames Water, UKPN, Southern Gas Networks installing new services to a new Development working under the same road closure for 5 days.

Yew Tree Bottom Road; Sutton and East Surrey Water, UK Power Networks, Southern Gas Networks and BT Openreach all working under Sutton and East Surrey’s road closure.
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 FPNs that differentiates between FPNs issued against Permit Condition Breaches, Working without a Permit and system generated FPNs.

The following information is therefore derived from alternative manual sort of data.

![Fixed Penalty Notices Issued against Working Without a Permit](chart.png)

**Chart 38 showing FPNs issued against working without a Permit against promoter in Years 1 & 2**

The imbalance in figures for SCC (0/38) is explained by instances of Working Without a Permit (WWP) for WRP not being recorded in the first year of Scheme operation. 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 to reduce WWP going forward. Most of these instances for Surrey’s own works were short duration reactive works to repair pot holes etc.

Other promoters figures are broadly in line year 1 to year 2 and whilst a zero target is the aim, the figures are encouragingly low.

In the financial year 2014/15, a sum of £7,060 was generated from Fixed Penalty Notices issued for Working Without a Permit. The corresponding figure for the 2015/16 financial year was £10,420.
There has been a disappointing second year increase in the number of Fixed Penalty Notices issued for Breach of Permit Conditions from the first year of Scheme operation.

Conditions attached to Permits and agreed by works promoters are intended to assist with meeting the overall Scheme objectives. The level of compliance represents a negative trend and we will encourage all works promoters to work with us to improve this statistic in future years.

In the financial year 2014/15, a sum of £59,100 was generated from Fixed Penalty Notices issued for Breach of Permit Conditions. The corresponding figure for the 2015/16 financial year was £66,660

In year one of Scheme operation the figure for Surrey’s own works was not recorded in the same way and so does not feature on this report. Such instances are now recorded within the EToN system itself and can now be reported in the same manner.
Deemed Permits

Deemed Permit volumes of 91 for Street Works and 67 for Works for Road Purposes represent percentages of 0.2% and 0.25% respectively for year one of Scheme operation reducing to 41 and 5, 0.1% and 0.03% respectively for year two of Scheme operation.

These low values illustrate the need for Network Coordinators to scrutinise the impact of all activities on Surrey’s road network to meet the resident 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 Local 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.

The content of this report illustrates that operation of the Permit Scheme over the first two years has brought about many of the desired improvements and benefits which were sought.

Accurate reporting mechanisms to better illustrate anecdotal successes and improvements are being developed and as recent changes to legislation become embedded and better understood elements of Scheme operation and wider Network Management will improve.

Areas of concern still remain; disappointing adherence to Permit Conditions which are specifically considered on a job-by-job case, which means that non-adherence may be adversely affecting the level of impact the activity has on residents and traffic flows. Surrey Officers continue to work closely with Works Promoter colleagues – both Statutory Undertakers and our own internal colleagues, in order to improve this compliance measure.

Surrey Officers will continue to work with all stakeholders to improve opportunities for collaborative working and the accurate recording of such collaboration.

General compliance to the overarching principle of Scheme operation remains high with very low volumes of works undertaken without a valid Permit.

A considerable advantage has been seen with the volumes of Works for Road Purposes activities now being Permitted, which were 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.
There has been a marginal decrease in calculated network occupancy days from 343,214 in year 1 to 325,189 in year 2 and we await future year’s data to establish whether this is a continuous downward trend.

Surrey will continue to incentivise works promoters to plan their activities better by offering discounted Permit fees for working in collaboration with others, and outside of traffic sensitive times.

Whilst the Scheme Permit fee income has not matched the legitimate costs of Scheme operation, Surrey Officers will carefully consider the outcome of the planned review of Traffic Sensitive Streets in the Street Gazetteer before considering consulting on any changes to Permit fee levels.

END
Glossary

AM – Authority Measure

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.

Gross domestic product (GDP) - is a monetary measure of the value of all final goods and services produced in a period

Gross value added (GVA) - is the measure of the value of goods and services produced in an area, industry or sector of an economy, in economics.

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.
## Appendix 2  
### Surrey Rate Card Hourly Mid Plate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payslip</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Payroll Code</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
<th>Weekly Rate</th>
<th>Monthly Rate</th>
<th>Yearly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Coord. 1</td>
<td>36 45 46 48</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>019 1215</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Coord. 2</td>
<td>36 45 46 48</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>019 1215</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Coord. 3</td>
<td>36 45 46 48</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>019 1215</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Coord. 4</td>
<td>36 45 46 48</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>019 1215</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Coord. 5</td>
<td>36 45 46 48</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>019 1215</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Coord. 6</td>
<td>36 45 46 48</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>019 1215</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. 1</td>
<td>36 40 42 43</td>
<td>1215 1215</td>
<td>1215 1215</td>
<td>1215 1215</td>
<td>1215 1215</td>
<td>1215 1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. 2</td>
<td>36 40 42 43</td>
<td>1215 1215</td>
<td>1215 1215</td>
<td>1215 1215</td>
<td>1215 1215</td>
<td>1215 1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coord. Admin.</td>
<td>36 37 38 39</td>
<td>1215 1215</td>
<td>1215 1215</td>
<td>1215 1215</td>
<td>1215 1215</td>
<td>1215 1215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payroll Code</th>
<th>Weekly Rate</th>
<th>Monthly Rate</th>
<th>Yearly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SVC 1</td>
<td>36 45 46 48</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVC 2</td>
<td>36 45 46 48</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVC 3</td>
<td>36 45 46 48</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVC 4</td>
<td>36 45 46 48</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm. 1</td>
<td>36 55 55 65</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm. 2</td>
<td>36 55 55 65</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. 1</td>
<td>36 40 42 43</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. 2</td>
<td>36 40 42 43</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency. Cover</td>
<td>36 40 42 43</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payroll Code</th>
<th>Weekly Rate</th>
<th>Monthly Rate</th>
<th>Yearly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist. 1</td>
<td>36 37 38 39</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. 2</td>
<td>36 37 38 39</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
<td>1215 019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Net Coord. 1 | 36 45 46 48 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 |
| Net Coord. 2 | 36 45 46 48 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 |
| Net Coord. 3 | 36 45 46 48 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 |
| Net Coord. 4 | 36 45 46 48 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 |
| Net Coord. 5 | 36 45 46 48 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 |
| Net Coord. 6 | 36 45 46 48 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 |
| Assist. 1 | 36 40 42 43 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 |
| Assist. 2 | 36 40 42 43 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 | 1215 019 |

Total: £1,057,700.00
Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes – October 2015

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>Company Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSkyB Telecommunications Services Ltd.</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABLE AND WIRELESS UK</td>
<td>[70]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLT TELECOMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>[7075]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept for Transport Stat Roads</td>
<td>[7188]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES Pipelines Ltd</td>
<td>[7260]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP Electricity Ltd</td>
<td>[7309]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSO</td>
<td>[7091]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUNETWORKS FIBER UK LTD</td>
<td>[7307]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulcrum Pipelines Limited</td>
<td>[7294]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAS TRANSPORTATION CO LTD</td>
<td>[7231]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL CROSSING</td>
<td>[7183]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Next Generation Networks Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Pipelines Limited</td>
<td>[7218]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Power Networks Ltd</td>
<td>[7281]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Communications (CSO)</td>
<td>[7082]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON TRANSPORT</td>
<td>[7210]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Grid Electric PLC</td>
<td>[7015]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETWORK RAIL -PROMOTERS NATIONAL</td>
<td>[7093]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange PCS Group</td>
<td>[7233]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romec</td>
<td>[7221]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Water</td>
<td>[9104]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSE Telecommunications Limited</td>
<td>[7244]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telefonica (O2 (UK) Limited)</td>
<td>[7182]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THUS</td>
<td>[7224]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Mobile (UK) Limited</td>
<td>[7250]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verizon Business Ltd</td>
<td>[7086]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>