CABINET MEMBER FOR REGENERATION AND ENVIRONMENT

Venue:  
Moorgate Street,  
Rotherham. S60 2TH

Date:  
Monday, 6th June, 2011

Time:  
10.30 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. To determine if the following matters are likely to be considered under the categories suggested, in accordance with Part 1 of Schedule 12A (as amended March 2006) to the Local Government Act 1972.

2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered later in the agenda as a matter of urgency.

3. Minutes of a meeting of the Local Development Framework Members' Steering Group held on 15th April, 2011. (copy attached) (Pages 1 - 4)
   - to note the content of the minutes.

4. Minutes of a meeting of the Sustainability Partnership held on 18th May, 2011. (copy attached) (Pages 5 - 10)
   - to note the content of the minutes.

5. Representation on Outside Bodies/appointments to sub-groups/panels etc - 2011-2012 Municipal Year. (report attached) (Pages 11 - 14)
   - to consider nominations and appointments.

   Simeon Leach, Economic Strategy Manager, to report.
   - to inform the Cabinet Member of the current situation with regard to enterprise support in the borough and to seek endorsement for exploring possible funding sources to continue provision of support post 2011, when the current ERDF project finishes.

7. Flood Risk Toolkit: Overcoming the Flood Risk Challenge in Rotherham Town Centre. (report attached) (Pages 19 - 22)
   Ryan Shepherd, Senior Planner, to report
   - to provide information on the Flood Risk Toolkit.

8. Rotherham Local Sites System - boundary corrections. (report attached) (Pages 23 - 26)
   Carolyn Barber, Ecology Development Officer, to report.
   - to seek approval of corrections made to the current series of local wildlife site boundaries.
9. A57 Worksop Road/Sheffield Road Improvement M1 Junction 31 to Todwick Crossroads. (report attached) (Pages 27 - 29)
Ian Ashmore, Principal Traffic Officer, to report.
- to detail the investigation into a petition received from Todwick Women’s Institute requesting the provision of a right turn lane from the A57 into Goosecarr Lane, hence permitting a right turning facility to be incorporated within the proposed major highway improvement scheme.

10. Car parking Standards. (report attached) (Pages 30 - 35)
Tom Finnegan-Smith, Transportation Unit Manager, to report.
- to consider the need for revised car parking standards.

11. Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Programme 2011/12. (report attached) (Pages 36 - 40)
Andy Butler, Senior Engineer, to report.
- to outline the proposed Local Transport Plan (LTP) Integrated Transport Programme for 2011/12.

12. Proposed New Pedestrian Refuges - various. (report attached) (Pages 41 - 45)
Nigel Davey, Engineer, to report.
- to seek approval to progress proposals to provide new pedestrian refuges at the following three identified locations within the borough:
  (i) A631 Rotherham Road, Maltby (see appendix A)
  (ii) B6066 Rotherham Road, Catcliffe (see appendix B)
  (iii) B6410 Woodhouse Green, Thurcroft (see appendix C)

13. Proposed pedestrian refuges - Worksop Road, Aston. (report attached) (Pages 46 - 48)
Andy Butler, Senior Engineer, to report.
- to seek Cabinet Member approval to provide a new pedestrian refuge adjacent to the Aston Joint Service Centre and to replace an existing Pelican crossing which no longer meets the criteria with a pedestrian refuge.

14. Proposal for Trial of part night switch off of street lighting. (report attached) (Pages 49 - 51)
Allan Lewis, Engineer, to report.
- to consider a proposal for a trial to switch off street lighting for part of the night at a set time to be conducted to help reduce energy costs.

15. Permit Scheme for Road and Street Works. (report attached) (Pages 52 - 72)
Andy Rowley, Streetpride Streetworks Engineer/Ian Ashmore, Principal Traffic Officer, to report.
- to report the outcome of the consultation for the introduction of a Permit Scheme for road and street works, and to seek authority to submit an application for a Permit Scheme on the busiest and most important traffic routes in the borough.

Date of Next Meeting
Wednesday, 22nd June, 2011
Members:
Councillor Smith, Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Environment
Councillor Walker, Senior Adviser
Councillor Tweed, Adviser
(Councillor Pickering, Chair, Planning Board;
Councillor Dodson, Vice-Chair, Planning Board
Councillor Whysall, Chair, Improving Places Select Commission
Councillor Falvey, Vice-Chair, Improving Places Select Commission)
1. **INTRODUCTIONS/APOLOGIES**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Diane Hurst, Area Partnership Manager, was introduced.

Apologies for absence were received from:-

- The Mayor, Councillor R. McNeely Member of the Steering Group
- Councillor J. Austen Member of the Steering Group
- Councillor B. Dodson Member of the Steering Group
- Councillor J. Doyle Member of the Steering Group
- Councillor I. St. John Member of the Steering Group
- Councillor S. Walker Member of the Steering Group
- Councillor J. Whysall Member of the Steering Group
- Councillor K. Wyatt Member of the Steering Group

2. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 18TH MARCH, 2011**

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting held on 18th March, 2011.

Resolved: That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 18th March, 2011 be approved as a correct record.

3. **MATTERS ARISING**

There were no matters arising from the previous minutes not covered by the agenda items.

4. **DRAFT CORE STRATEGY**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Strategic Policy Team
It was reported that, subject to approval by the Cabinet, the Draft Core Strategy would be out for public consultation during summer 2011.

A brief summary of the background to the development of this document was given, and reference was made to the vision and objectives of the Strategy.

Reference was made to the anticipated abolition of regional strategies and the Council’s proposal for a lower local housing target. Reference was also made to the employment land requirement over the plan period.

It was explained that the Draft Core Strategy contained a suite of 33 strategic policies grouped under four themes as follows:-

- Spatial strategy
- Sustainable communities
- Climate change
- New infrastructure

Also the Sites and Policies Document would be taken forward in tandem with the Draft Core Strategy during the public consultation.

Members present referred to:

- the consultation process
- the housing target
- the timeline
- implications of the Localism Bill re: Greenfield/brownfield
- the importance of Members’ briefings

Resolved:- (1) That insofar as this Steering Group is concerned the Draft Core Strategy be endorsed.

(2) That the Cabinet be recommended to approve the Draft Core Strategy for approval for public consultation.

5. LDF SITES ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Consideration was given to a report presented by the Area & Environmental Planning Team Leader, supported by a PowerPoint presentation, in respect of the proposed Summer 2011 consultation on the Local Development Framework’s Core Strategy Final Draft which will be accompanied by the Issues and Options version of the Sites and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD).

It was explained that it was the role of the Sites and Policies DPD to identify the actual location of new sites to meet the Borough’s settlement targets for growth set out in the Core Strategy.

The report provided an outline of the consultation document.
Further information was provided by the Senior Planner in respect of the consultation process, development of a community engagement action plan and timescale.

Members present referred to:

- lessons learned from previous consultations
- the need to ensure elected members were fully briefed
- the Area Assembly network and role of the Co-ordinating Groups
- ensuring that the public had every means available to respond

Information in respect of the type of consultation and community engagement activities that have been planned over the summer months, and an outline of the type of events and activities proposed would be shared with the Cabinet.

Resolved:- That insofar as this Steering Group is concerned the proposed outline of the Sites and Policies Development Plan Document be supported with the full version being submitted to Cabinet for approval for consultation.

6. NEW CONSERVATION AREAS

Consideration was given to a report presented by the Area and Environmental Planning Team Leader, together with a PowerPoint presentation, detailing the Borough’s current 26 existing Conservation Areas, and to the review (under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990) and ENV2.10 of the Unitary Development Plan which identified a potential 12 further settlements for designation as Conservation Areas.

A brief summary was given of the background to the compilation of the list of sites, and to the definition of sites. It was explained that the effect of the designation meant that any change must be carefully and sympathetically managed.

It was reported that it was intended to combine this process within the Local Development Framework’s draft Sites and Policies Document for public consultation later this year.

Following appraisal the following sites were proposed for inclusion:-

Maltby (Church); Letwell; Stone; Firbeck; Ulley; Thrybergh; Upper Whiston; Morthen; Hooton Roberts; Throapham; Brookhouse: (all previously listed in the Unitary Development Plan).

However it was pointed out that sites at Chesterfield Canal (Turnerwood and Norwood) had not been put forward for inclusion as it was considered these were adequately protected as listed buildings.

Maps showing the proposed Conservation Areas were made available at the meeting.

It was explained that the consultation process would provide an opportunity for further sites to be suggested for designation as conservation areas.
Resolved: [1] That the contents of the report be noted.


7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Joint Waste DPD

It was reported that this document which had been produced jointly with Barnsley and Doncaster MBCs was published on 11th April for a six week statutory consultation period during which representations on its soundness could be made.

Following the consultation the document would be submitted to the Secretary of State for examination later in 2011.

It was explained that Member briefing sessions were arranged for each area and prior to Cabinet.

8. DATE, TIME AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Local Development Framework Members’ Steering Group be held on FRIDAY, 17TH JUNE, 2011 at 10.00 a.m. – Town Hall, Moorgate Street, Rotherham.
Attendees:-

Councillor Smith (in the Chair); Councillor Pickering

together with: -

Martin Aizlewood RFT
Carolyn Barber Ecologist, RMBC
Dominic Beck BRChamber (for Andrew Denniff)
Deborah Fellowes Policy Manager, RMBC
Steve Hallsworth Leisure Services Manager, RMBC
Sally Jenks NHSR
Hugh Long Projects, Customer Interface Officer, RMBC
David Rhodes Environmental Property Manager, RMBC
Alice Rodgers VAR
David Wilde South Yorkshire Schools Climate Change Officer, Sheffield City Council

69. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from: -

The Mayor, Councillor McNeely
David Burton Director of Streetpride
Andrew Denniff BRChamber

70. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 30TH MARCH, 2011

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Sustainability Partnership held on 30th March, 2011, received and the contents noted.

71. ANY MATTERS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

There were no matters arising from the previous minutes not covered by the agenda items.

72. SUSTAINABILITY PARTNERSHIP - TERMS OF REFERENCE

Further to Minute No. 64 of the meeting held on 30th March, 2011, consideration was given to the Terms of Reference of the Partnership.

David Rhodes explained that partnership members had not been totally happy with the vision statement, and therefore two options had been compiled for discussion and decision:

Option 1:- “We will make Rotherham a sustainable community, with a
good quality of life, a healthy environment, prosperous economy and inclusive society."

Option 2: - “We will strive to make Rotherham a community that meets the needs of its citizens by creating a sustainable environment through partnership working.”

**It was agreed**:- That Option 1 be adopted as the “vision statement” for the Sustainability Partnership.

---

**ROTHERHAM’S ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN 2011-2015 - DRAFT**

David Rhodes submitted a report which highlighted proposed changes following further consultation with partners.

The proposed changes had taken into account the various comments made at the previous meeting.

It was however pointed out that there were two additional comments:–

(i) the need to identify proposed reporting links within the revised Local Strategic Partnership

(ii) the Challenge of Climate Change – the need to specifically mention Carbon Reduction

Dominic Beck reported that there was a local procurement supply chain event being held on 31st May at Magna being promoted by JMI (Rotherham Community Football Stadium) and was open to local businesses. A further event was scheduled at the end of June.

**It was agreed**:- (1) That Deborah Fellowes would pursue this with the LSP and action comment (i) above.

(2) That David Rhodes ensures that Carbon Reduction is included in the strategy and action comment (ii) above.

(3) That Dominic Beck provides David Rhodes with the information regarding the procurement supply chain events for the Procurement Panel.

---

**BRIEFING NOTE: SCHOOL SUSTAINABILITY WORKSHOP MAY 11**

Hugh Long, spoke to a briefing note in respect of a workshop held on 11th May re: School Sustainability Workshop (promoted by the South Yorkshire Climate Change Project) which took place in the Walled garden centre at Clifton Park.

Reference was made to:-
• the opportunity for Rotherham schools to showcase their various initiatives promoting sustainability in schools.

• school that have signed up:-
  Aston C of E
  Abbey School
  Rudston Prep
  Brampton Cortonwood infants
  Treeton C of E
  Aston Fence
  Newman School
  Kilnhurst St Thomas

• number of schools that volunteered to present their successes in an informal manner.

• variety of ‘experts’ on hand to provide advice to schools on a number of topics e.g. waste minimisation, composting, recycling, energy, carbon foot printing and waste free lunches.

• how to produce useful and decorative items from waste aluminium cans e.g. keyrings.

• workshop provided free of charge by Community Casting

Members commented on:-

• Development of social enterprises
• Facilitated workshop by Rotherham based Casting Innovations Ltd – Recycling, education, schools, community etc. (offering a unique range of interactive recycling workshops, using aluminium and glass, that are completely mobile. www.leejamesbrooks71475.rotherham.towntalk.co.uk)

• Engaging and inspiring children in recycling in an imaginative way
• Funding to concentrate on schools within the Dearne Valley to get them through ECO Schools
• Working with 10 schools outside of the Dearne to reduce CO2 emissions

75. BRIEFING NOTE: WASTE PAPER RECYCLING IN SCHOOLS UPDATE MAY 11

Hugh Long presented a briefing note updating the Partnership about waste paper recycling in schools.

The following aspects were highlighted:-

• Growth of the waste paper recycling scheme in Rotherham’s since its introduction in 2006.
• Last year over 119 tonnes of waste paper were collected from 90 schools.
• 77 schools have paper banks.
• 11 schools have a kerbside blue bag collection service.
• 2 schools now have trial 140 litre blue waste paper bins.
• The scheme is offered to schools at no cost.
• Waste management have trialled a new 140 litre blue waste paper container for the collection of waste paper from schools.
• This new container has proved successful and it is now being offered to schools that are on the kerbside blue bag collection service.
• The Waste Minimisation / recycling team will be visiting schools to develop the new scheme and also to promote recycling / waste minimisation advice.
• Developing our own in house waste paper recycling scheme for schools will mean that the Council can generate income from the recycling of waste paper, while still providing a free service to schools.
• Waste Management will look to gradually phase out the kerbside blue paper bag in schools and replace them with 140 blue bins.
• Once this is complete Waste Management will look to replace the paper banks in schools with a number of 140 litre blue bins.
• Waste management will also continue to offer the service free of charge to all schools in Rotherham.

Members commented on:-

- % of waste paper recycled in schools
- Excellence of Trinity Croft Primary school
- Informal league table
- Proposed visits to school to provide updates
- Pupils’ concern about the amount of packaging from YPO

**It was agreed:-** That the issue of YPO packaging be followed up by David Rhodes.

**ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The following issues were raised:-

(i) Rotherham in Root

Dave Wilde reported that the feedback report on this project was being finalised. Consideration would be given on how to take this project forward.

It was reported that Rotherham in Root would be at the event at Clifton Park on 29th May to gather more information about what was going on in Rotherham re: growing your own food etc., and a way forward would be formulated.

(ii) Urban Parks Bee Project
Carolyn Barber reported that the project had been established and delivered in conjunction with Greenspaces with £2,000 of funding from LABGI.

The Project had:-

- Planted 1500 crocuses, 500 bluebells, 500 wild daffodils, over 5 sites (Maltby Manor, Bradgate, Greasbrough, Ferham, and Greenlands parks)

- Planted 1 extra heavy standard Whitebeam, 1 extra heavy standard Rowan, 1 extra heavy standard Field Maple. A native hedge inc Hawthorne (200), Hazel (20), Guelder Rose (10) and Spindle (10). All planted on Maltby Manor Fields.

- Built 2 insect hotels, one in Greasbrough, the other in the school grounds at Anston Greenlands.

- Made and planted 16 underground bee nests, 8 in Ferham and 8 in Bradgate

- Sown 5 wildflower meadows with a cornfield annual mix and a bee mix over 4 sites (Bradgate x2, Greasbrough, Ferham and Greenlands). We had to spay and rotovate the areas prior to sowing.

- Planted 312 wildflower plug plants, Primrose (104), Red Campion (104), Cowslip (104)

- In total 362 children and 42 adults had been involved in the project.

It was reported that Donna Morton, Green Spaces Officer, undertook the vast majority of the delivery work and received very positive comments from teaching staff whilst on site. The children had benefitted from helping with all elements of the project, most of which fitted in with the National Curriculum.

Members of the Partnership commented on the terrific results of this project.

(iii) School Governors

It was pointed out that the majority of elected members were also school Governors. Reference was made to ways to encourage the remaining 43 schools to become involved in the waste paper recycling in schools.

**It was agreed:-** That Hugh Long would compile a paper for circulation to schools explaining the benefits.

(iv) Survey of Fruit Trees
Reference was made to fruit trees throughout the borough many of which were often ignored.

It was reported that there was no Council resource to do a survey.

(v) 2010 Rotherham Ltd

It was reported that 2010 Rotherham Ltd, in conjunction with Groundwork and staff at Clifton Park, was looking at a scheme to design gardens (currently not well tended) that were not purely ornamental i.e. including vegetables.

77. DATE, TIME AND PLACE FOR THE NEXT MEETING

It was agreed:- That the next meeting of the Sustainability Partnership be held on Wednesday, 20th July, 2011 at 2.00 p.m.
5. Summary

The purpose of this report is to consider appointments to outside bodies and membership of sub-groups/panels etc for the 2011-2012 Municipal Year, which fall within the Cabinet Member’s portfolio.

6. Recommendation:

That the Cabinet Member considers the required appointments and memberships as detailed in the Appendix to this report.
7. Proposals and Details

To ensure that the Council’s interests are represented.
To ensure continuation of the Council’s work and services.
To comply with legislation and Council strategies and policies.
To continue to work towards meeting regional and national targets.

8. Finance

Costs associated with travel, subsistence and accommodation to be accommodated within existing budget.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

Non-representation may result in the Council’s interests not being upheld.
Possible impact on service delivery.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Representation on outside bodies and the membership of working Committees and Panels will ensure Council policies are communicated and that the Council’s performance is aligned with national, regional and local developments.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Appendix: List of outside bodies and sub-groups/panels

Contact Name: Janet Cromack, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Ext: 22055
Email: janet.cromack@rotherham.gov.uk

Report re Outside bodies/sub-groups etc 2011-2012
REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COUNCIL ON OUTSIDE BODIES – MUNICIPAL YEAR 2011-2012

For determination by the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Environment - Councillor Smith

ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE EXCELLENCE (APSE)
- Cabinet Member, Regeneration and Environment, Councillor Smith

CHESTERFIELD CANAL PARTNERSHIP
Councillor Whysall

DEARNE AND DOVE INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD
Councillor Hodgkiss

PLANNING AID COMMUNITY CHAMPION
Vice-Chair, Planning Board - Councillor Dodson

ROBIN HOOD AIRPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
Councillor Walker, Senior Adviser
Substitute:

TRANS-PENNINE TRAIL
Councillor Pickering, Chair, Planning Board (Substitute: Councillor Walker)

MEMBERSHIP OF PANELS/SUB-GROUPS ETC – 2011-2012 MUNICIPAL YEAR

RECYCLING GROUP
Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Environment, Councillor Smith (Chair)
Senior Adviser, Regeneration and Environment, Councillor Walker
Cabinet Member for Town Centres, Councillor R. S. Russell
Senior Adviser for Town Centres, Councillor Ali
Adviser for Town Centres, Councillor Swift
Cabinet Member for Safe and Attractive Neighbourhoods, Councillor McNeely
Senior Adviser, Safe and Attractive Neighbourhoods, Councillor Goulty
Senior Adviser, Culture, Lifestyle, Sport and Tourism, Councillor Dalton
Chair, Improving Places Select Commission, Councillor Whysall
Councillor Nightingale, BDR Representative

ROTHO VALLEY COUNTRY PARK MEMBERS STEERING GROUP
Cabinet Member, Culture, Lifestyle, Sport & Tourism, Councillor Rushforth
Cabinet Member, Regeneration & Environment, Councillor G. Smith, (also Ward 6 (Holderness))
Ward 6 (Holderness):- Councillors Pitchley and Jack
Ward 11 (Rother Vale):- Councillors Nightingale, R. S. Russell and Swift
Ward 18 (Wales):- Councillors Beck, Fenoughty and Whysall
ROtherham Local Development Framework Members’ Steering Group
Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Environment (Chair), Councillor Smith
All other Cabinet Members
Senior Adviser, Regeneration and Environment, Councillor Walker
Chair, Planning Board, Councillor Pickering
Vice-Chair, Planning Board, Councillor Dodson
Chair, Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, Councillor Whelbourn
Chairs of the 4 Select Commissions
Ward Councillors (when required)

Sustainability Partnership
Cabinet Member, Regeneration and Environment (Chair), Councillor Smith
Cabinet Member for Safe and Attractive Neighbourhoods, Councillor McNeely
Chair, Planning Board, Councillor Pickering
One vacancy

Parish Liaison Committee:-(General & Ad Hoc Meetings):-
Cabinet Member, Regeneration and Environment (Chair), Councillor Smith
Senior Adviser, Regeneration and Environment, Councillor Walker
Chair, Planning Board, Councillor Pickering
Vice-Chair, Planning Board, Councillor Dodson
as required:-
Cabinet Member for Culture, Lifestyle, Sport and Tourism, Councillor Rushforth
Cabinet Member for Town Centres, Councillor R. S. Russell

Transport Liaison Panel:-
The Leader, Councillor Stone
Deputy Leader, Councillor Akhtar
Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Environment & SYITA Representative - Councillor Smith (Chair),
SYITA Representative, Councillor R. S. Russell

And one member from each Ward as follows:-

Ward 1 – Burton          Ward 9 – Beaumont          Ward 18 – Whysall
Ward 2 – Wootton        Ward 10 – Whelbourn        Ward 19 – Atkin
Ward 3 – Buckley        Ward 11 – Swift            Ward 20 – Read
Ward 4 – Falvey         Ward 12 – Dodson           Ward 21 – Goulty
Ward 5 – Turner         Ward 13 – Sims             Ward 14 – vacancy
Ward 6 – Pitchley       Ward 15 – Mannion
Ward 7 – Hodgkiss
Ward 8 – Barron
Ward 16 – License
Ward 17 – Pickering
5. Summary
This paper informs the Cabinet Member of the current situation with regard to enterprise support in the borough and to seek endorsement for exploring possible funding sources to continue provision of support post 2011, when the current ERDF project finishes.

6. Recommendations

- To note the report.

- Task the Regeneration Team in EDS, to lead on developing a potential Regional Growth Fund bid to extend the lifetime of the current project.
7. Proposals and Details

Background
Rotherham has a history of good practice in the support of business starts and new businesses in their early years of operation. This support includes:

- A network of RMBC Business Incubation Centres (BICs) at Magna, Dinnington, Moorgate Crofts and the Dearne Valley
- A Beacon Award for “Supporting New Businesses”
- Reigning Champion of the “Enterprising Britain” competition.
- UKBI National Champions (2005 and 2011)
- Rotherham Ready
- Rotherham Youth Enterprise

Rotherham Enterprising Neighbourhoods
In order to build on this experience and to promote self-employment in the more deprived areas of the Borough, the Rotherham Enterprising Neighbourhoods project commenced in January 2009.

The project is a partnership between RMBC (RiDO & CYPS), VAR and Barnsley and Rotherham Chamber of Commerce. They each deliver a different strand of activity, although these are linked together to provide the best strategic impact. The various strands being:

**Community Business Coaches (RMBC - RiDO):** Coaches focusing on working with people from the most deprived areas of the Borough, supporting them to set up their own businesses. Some cases studies of people assisted through this strand of the project are attached to the report as an appendix.

**Business Community Support Officers (Chamber):** Working with new businesses within the Borough, predominantly those 1-3 years old.

**Rotherham Ready (RMBC – CYPS):** Works with schools across the borough to embed enterprise learning by enabling teachers to identify and highlight enterprise skills in lessons taught under the current curriculum.

**Rotherham Youth Enterprise (RMBC – CYPS):** Provides support to young people aged 18 -30 to start their own businesses and to promote self-employment as a viable career option to those leaving fulltime education.

**Social Enterprise Support (VAR):** Provides support to people seeking to set up social enterprises within the borough and to existing social enterprises.

To the end of 2010, the project has delivered the following outputs against the agreed profile:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Profile to 31/12/10</th>
<th>Actual to 31/12/10</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of new businesses created</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of businesses created that are social enterprises</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of new jobs created</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Jobs Safeguarded</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of SME businesses assisted</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of social enterprises assisted</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New jobs created for women</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New jobs created for BAME</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New businesses created majority female owned</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New business created majority BAME owned</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs safeguarded for women</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs safeguarded for BAME</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The way forward
With cuts being made across the public sector, the current level of business support is likely to reduce appreciably. Business Link Yorkshire reduced its service from 1st April 2011. The majority of business advisers will leave and it will become predominantly an internet and phone portal. The Enterprising Neighbourhoods project currently ends on 31st December 2011.

It is suggested that with ERDF funds still available; a bid is submitted to the Regional Growth Fund (RGF) for a 2-3 year extension of the existing project. The job and business creation potential evidenced in its lifetime to date should mean that it will have a reasonable chance of meeting the selection criteria for the RGF.

Any extension to the project would seek to continue and build on those parts of the existing activity that have been demonstrably successful. It would also seek to fill any gaps in provision that can be identified through consultation with partners and stakeholders.

8. Finance
The total value of the Enterprising Neighbourhoods project is £6,608,865. This is split between ERDF (£3,568,785) and a variety of match funding (£3,040,080), which had already been defrayed prior to the project commencing.
Any bid to RGF would need to be for a minimum of £1 million, meaning additional funding of £2 million when this was matched with ERDF.

9. Risks and Uncertainties
In the current economic climate the amount of available external funding has reduced significantly. Although there is additional ERDF available to support an extension to the
activity this would need matching by other “clean” sources of funding in roughly a 50/50 split.

Failure to secure match funding will mean the project ceasing at the end of 2011, or early 2012 if the money can be stretched until then. After this, any business support provision would have to be delivered by the market and the LEP have already stated that they would want this to be focused on potential high-growth sectors with the recipients paying market price for any support they receive. Therefore any activity of this type will need to be funded and managed at a local level.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications
The suite of enterprise support activities currently operating in the borough contribute to the following strategic priorities of the Community Strategy:-

- Promote innovation, enterprising behaviour, competitiveness and sustainability
- Promote business start ups, growth and inward investment
- Promote business growth and improved productivity by supporting employers to develop and train existing staff.
- Improve skill levels of the working age population

11. Background Papers and Consultation
A copy of the Enterprising Neighbourhoods ERDF bid is available on request.

RMBC Finance have been consulted in the writing of this report.

Contact Name:
Simeon Leach
Regeneration Manager
Tel: 01709 82 3828
E-mail: simeon.leach@rotherham.gov.uk
1. **Meeting:** Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Environment

2. **Date:** 6 June 2011

3. **Title:** Flood Risk Toolkit: Overcoming the Flood Risk Challenge in Rotherham Town Centre

4. **Programme Area:** Forward Planning, Environment & Development Services

---

### 5. Summary

This report provides information on the Flood Risk Toolkit which has been produced. Focused on Rotherham town centre and surrounding areas, it is intended to help developers and decision makers address planning policy flood risk requirements within the context of the Council’s regeneration aspirations for Rotherham town centre. This report summarises the content and implications of the documents and how they will be taken forward.

### 6. Recommendations

1. That Cabinet Member notes the content of this report and the Flood Risk Toolkit
2. That Cabinet Member endorse the use of the Flood Risk Toolkit in determining planning applications, making other planning decisions and as part of the evidence base for preparing the Local Development Framework
7. Proposals and Details

Background
The Council, along with partners such as the Environment Agency, has invested significantly in responding to flood risk issues within Rotherham following the flood events in 2000 and 2007. Crucially this has resulted in the development of a community wide Rotherham Renaissance Flood Alleviation Scheme intended to reduce the threat of flood risk through the centre of Rotherham, which is a key focus for regeneration and Rotherham’s Renaissance aspirations.

The Council is also producing its Local Development Framework which will set out the policies to guide new development in the future and allocate land for new development. The Flood Risk Toolkit will act as a vital piece of evidence base to inform the policies and content of the Local Development Framework.

The Council already provides guidance for developers when considering developing within the Town Centre and throughout the Borough of Rotherham. The document is known as Development Control Requirements for Flood Risk Assessments, and provides general guidance to developers. However the Flood Risk Toolkit, produced for the Council by consultants Jacobs, is intended to help address specific flood risk issues in and around Rotherham town centre. The toolkit includes:

- A ‘how to guide’ setting out how it can be used to assist developers when submitting planning applications (including a checklist which will provide a useful aid for developers and decision makers)
- A Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for Rotherham town centre and surrounding areas. This is accompanied by a guide to the Sequential Approach required by Planning Policy Statement 25 (Development and Flood Risk).
- A Design Guide setting out technical specifications intended to ensure that new development of flood defence works meets the requirements of the Rotherham Regeneration Flood Alleviation Scheme.

Planning Policy Statement 25 (Development and Flood Risk) requires that local authorities prepare Strategic Flood Risk Assessments (SFRA) to inform planning decisions and contribute to the evidence base for preparing Local Development Frameworks, for example by guiding the allocation of land in order to limit flood risk to people and to new and existing properties. These documents consider a number of key questions: what may flood, how, where, when and how often. They also consider the likely extent of flooding.

Two documents have been produced in Rotherham; a Level 1 SFRA (in 2008) covering the whole borough, and a Level 2 SFRA for Rotherham town centre and surrounding areas.

The Level 1 SFRA recognised that parts of Rotherham town centre and surrounding areas contain areas of medium to high flood risk. However as the Borough’s principal service centre and given its location at the heart of the urban area, it is a key development and regeneration area. In conjunction with the Environment Agency
significant investment has already gone into the community wide flood alleviation scheme, to address flood issues in these areas.

The Level 2 SFRA has been produced to help address these more specific challenges. It splits the study area into nine character zones and provides guidance on the acceptability of different types of uses, advises on applying the sequential and exception tests and addresses flood mitigation and resilience issues.

It recognises the flood risks present but acknowledges that continuing development is necessary for wider sustainable development and town centre regeneration reasons. It concludes that the flood risk and regeneration challenges within and adjacent to Rotherham Town Centre can be overcome through a pro-active and comprehensive strategy towards flood risk management. This will involve all parties working together from the outset to deliver the vision by managing flood risk.

The Toolkit it is intended to strengthen the planning links with the Rotherham Renaissance Flood Alleviation Scheme to reduce the risk of flooding in the Town Centre and provide greater certainty to support the regeneration and planning objectives for the Town Centre. It therefore also provides more practical assistance to developers when submitting planning applications.

It also recognises the importance of the Flood Alleviation Scheme to achieving Rotherham’s Renaissance objectives. Phase 1 of the Scheme has been delivered, however the remainder is likely to be delivered incrementally as new development proceeds. Given this incremental approach the Toolkit contains a design guide which has set out how new flood risk management works should be designed to be compatible with the requirements of the Flood Alleviation Scheme, acknowledging that until the Scheme is completed (and to the parameters it has been designed to) the full benefits in terms of reduced threat of flood risk will not be realised.

Next Steps
It is intended that the Flood Risk Toolkit will eventually be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document. Until this can be achieved it is intended that it will be used as a best practice document. It is intended that it will be used to assist in the determination of planning applications which fall within the Flood Risk Toolkit area by the local Planning Authority, and by the Environment Agency in responding to planning application consultations. An update report will be taken to Planning Board to ensure that Members are aware of the Flood Risk Toolkit.

It will form part of the evidence base to inform production of the Local Development Framework, in particular the development of policies and the allocation of sites for new development. The Core Strategy, which is expected to be subject to further consultation in summer 2011, will include draft policies relating to flood risk in the Town Centre to support the delivery of the Town Centre Vision and to support the regeneration objectives for this area.

8. Finance
This report has no direct financial implications for the Council. The Flood Risk Toolkit has been jointly funded by Forward Planning and RIDO, including ERDF funding through the Managing Adaptive Responses to changing flood risk (MARE) scheme.
In implementing the guidance in the Flood Risk Toolkit there may be financial implications for future developers in ensuring that flood risk is minimised and that appropriate design / mitigation measures are adopted.

9. Risks and Uncertainties
Strategic Flood Risk Assessments are required as part of the LDF evidence base. They also help inform decision making for planning applications. In their absence there is a risk that the Core Strategy and Sites and Policies DPDs may be found unsound at examination. It is important that the content of the Flood Risk Toolkit documents is taken into account by decision makers to ensure that flood risk is not increased by new development and that appropriate mitigation measures are undertaken.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications
The Flood Risk Toolkit contributes positively towards the aims of Rotherham’s Community Strategy and Rotherham’s Renaissance aspirations. It contributes towards ensuring certainty for developers and decision makers, and in seeking to overcome flood risk challenges it supports investment within Rotherham town centre and its surrounding areas.

11. Background Papers and Consultation
Flood Risk Toolkit:
http://intranet.rotherhamconnect.com/C0/PlanningRegen/default.aspx
Documents are within the ‘Flood Risk Toolkit’ folder of the document library.

Borough Wide Strategic Flood Risk Assessment:
http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/856/local_development_framework

Development Control Requirements for Flood Risk Assessments
https://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/file/3671/development_control_requirements_for_flood_risk_assessments

Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk

The Flood Risk Toolkit has been produced in conjunction with the Council’s drainage, planning and regeneration programme areas, and in consultation with the Environment Agency.

Contact Name: Ryan Shepherd, Senior Planner, Ext.3888, ryan.shepherd@rotherham.gov.uk
1. Meeting: Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Environment

2. Date: 6 June 2011

3. Title: Rotherham Local Site System – boundary corrections

4. Programme Area: Environment and Development Services

5. Summary

This report seeks approval of corrections made to the current series of Local Wildlife Site boundaries.

6. Recommendations

- That the corrected Local Wildlife Site boundaries be accepted;
- That approval is given to proceed with the integration of the corrected Local Wildlife Sites boundaries into the preparation of the Local Development Framework and in the determination of relevant planning applications.
Proposal and Details

The 2010 series of Local Wildlife Site boundaries was accepted by Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Environment 24.01.2011 under minute G96. It has come to light that a number of the site boundaries had been drawn encompassing residential and/or agricultural buildings; this is contrary to the adopted Rotherham Local Wildlife Site System Framework which states:

“The selection guidelines will not be applied to domestic or industrial (including agricultural) buildings, or to domestic gardens. Other artificial structures, for example, mine shafts, tunnels, bridges, historic monuments (except those that are also domestic dwellings), may, however, be considered for designation.”

Corrections have been made to the relevant sites to exclude the buildings in line with the framework standards.

It is recommended that the corrected boundaries be accepted and that approval is given to proceed with the integration of the corrected Local Wildlife Sites boundaries into the preparation of the Local Development Framework and in the determination of relevant planning applications.

An update of the Local Wildlife Site series map is attached in Appendix One.

8. Finance

The cost of the Local Wildlife Site correction work has been met by the EDS Forward Planning budget.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The operation of a Local Site System enables RMBC to demonstrate compliance with current legislation and planning policy including the need to have a robust evidence base. The Local Wildlife Site System, as approved, includes a responsibility for any additions and amendments to the site list to be reported annually to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Environment.

Where errors are identified in the evidence base it is appropriate to make corrections and follow the approved route for acceptance of the amendments. The approval for this amendment is sought now to enable the amended series of sites to be reflected in the preparation of the Local Development Framework.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Planning Policy Statement 12 (ODPM, 2008) states that areas of protection, such as nationally protected landscape and internationally, nationally and locally designated areas and sites, should be included on adopted proposals maps.

Planning Policy Statement 9 (ODPM 2005) states that ‘sites of regional and local biodiversity and geological interest, which include Regionally Important Geological Sites, Local Nature Reserves and Local Sites, have a fundamental role to play in
meeting overall national biodiversity targets; contributing to the quality of life and the
wellbeing of the community; and in supporting research and education. Criteria-based
policies should be established in local development documents against which
proposals for any development on, or affecting, such sites will be judged.'

Planning for Biodiversity and Geological conservation – A guide to Good Practice
(ODPM 2005) states that local development frameworks should indicate the location
of designated sites of importance for biodiversity and geodiversity, making clear
distinctions between the hierarchy of international, national, regional and locally
designated sites’.

The maintenance of a Local Site system and positive site management are essential
elements of Local Area Agreement Indicator NI197 – ‘Improved local biodiversity –
active management of local sites’.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

  Rotherham Local Wildlife Site System:
  - Part 1: The Framework for Rotherham’s Local Wildlife Site System,
  - Part 2: Site Selection Guidelines for Rotherham.
- Defra Local Sites – Guidance on their Identification, Selection and Management
  (February 2006)
- Former Cabinet Member for Economic and Regeneration and Development
  Services  (5.4.2006) RMBC http://moderngov.rotherham.gov.uk
- Former Cabinet Member for Economic and Regeneration and Development
- ODPM Planning Policy Statement 9 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
  (2005)
- ODPM Planning for Biodiversity and Geological Conservation – A guide to Good
  Practice (ODPM 2005)
- RMBC Cabinet (17.12.08) http://moderngov.rotherham.gov.uk
- The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006
  CLG National Indicators for Local Authorities and Local Authority Partnerships
- RMBC Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Environment (24.01.2011)
  http://moderngov.rotherham.gov.uk

Contact Names: Carolyn Barber, Ecology Development Officer 822462.
5. Summary

The report details the investigation into a petition received from Todwick Women’s Institute requesting the provision of a right turn lane from the A57 into Goosecarr Lane, hence permitting a right turning facility to be incorporated within the proposed major highway improvement scheme.

6. Recommendation

   i) Cabinet Member does not accede to the request to incorporate a right turn facility into the A57 highway improvement scheme and the lead petitioner be informed of the decision.

   ii) Cabinet Member reaffirms the decision of 18 April 2011 to implement the scheme in accordance with the layout detailed in drawing number 122/A57(T).51A/DM7.
7. Proposals and Details

The Todwick Women’s Institute have submitted a petition in respect of a request to incorporate a right turn facility from the A57 to Goosecarr Lane into the proposals for the A57 Worksop Road / Sheffield Road M1 Junction 31 to Todwick Crossroads Highway Improvement scheme. The reasons for the request are as follows:

A. Additional traffic flows on Kiveton Lane
B. Accessibility to bus services on Goosecarr Lane
C. Additional travel distances incurred by local residents

All of the above issues have been considered in detail during the scheme development; these and other issues raised by the local community have been assessed during the many years of the scheme development and consultation processes. Where appropriate and reasonably practicable, requests for amendments to the scheme through the consultation processes have been incorporated within the scheme.

Specifically, the details of the reasoning behind the request and responses are detailed below:

1. “Kiveton Lane is already a very busy road and an extra 3000 vehicles per day – some being very heavy lorries – passing our Junior and Infant School is totally unacceptable.”

The alleged increase in traffic of 3000 vehicles per day is considered to be an exaggeration. The Council’s assessment is that traffic flows on Kiveton Lane in a southerly direction only, would increase by approximately 3 vehicles per minute in the peak hour, and over the day the traffic volume would increase by around 1/3 of that alleged above. It should be remembered that this traffic is local traffic, and a corresponding reduction in traffic flow will occur on Goosecarr Lane and The Pastures, which is a similar standard of highway to Kiveton Lane. Northbound traffic patterns through Todwick Village remain unchanged and no through traffic on the A57 would be diverted into the Village. It should also be recognised that whilst the school entrance is on Kiveton Lane, the reality is that the school is situated almost on the corner of Kiveton Lane and The Pastures, with the school crossing patrol assisting children crossing on both arms of the junction; therefore the total volume of traffic around the junction in the centre of the village remains substantially unchanged.

2. “Bus routes still need to pick up / let off residents on Goosecarr Lane.”

Discussions have been held with the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTE) throughout the scheme development and the accessibility to public transport remains to be deemed satisfactory. Bus services in a northerly direction would remain unchanged. In a southerly direction, there is currently one service per hour Monday to Saturday and no service on Sunday. This service would likely divert via Kiveton Lane. There are three bus stops affected, two on Goosecarr Lane, near to the terrace properties, and one on The Pastures, near to the junction with Kiveton Lane. To service the needs of public transport users on Goosecarr Lane, a bus stop will be provided on the A57, only a short walk away, and there would be a signalised crossing facility on the A57 to assist pedestrians. There is an existing bus stop on Kiveton Lane, near to the junction with The Pastures and users of public transport in this vicinity would utilise this facility. Other sections of
Goosecarr Lane are rural in nature and there are no existing bus stops due to little or no demand.

3. “Access into Goosecarr Lane is vital to prevent thousands of extra miles per year being done by residents getting to their homes with all the associated environmental issues that brings.”

There are a few properties at the northern extremity of Goosecarr Lane, where access from the A57 west will require traffic to either travel to the new roundabout and U-turn or travel along Kiveton Lane and The Pastures. The majority of residential properties affected are situated off The Pastures; access to these properties would be via Kiveton Lane. It is expected that additional journey distances will not be significant; indeed the change in travel distance from the A57 / Goosecarr Lane junction to the Kiveton Lane / The Pastures junction travelling via the A57 and Kiveton Lane rather than via Goosecarr Lane is only 200m.

It is recognised that there will be a small amount of inconvenience incurred by some residents regarding access, particularly those on Goosecarr Lane, however, none of the petitioners appear to reside at any of these properties. It is considered that the overall benefits of the proposed highway scheme outweigh this inconvenience. The issues surrounding bus routes has been addressed, and what seems to be the primary issue of traffic around the school, when examined in detail, does not appear have the degree of significance as alleged by the petitioners.

8. Finance

There are no financial considerations regarding the issues raised in this report.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

None are identified within the context of this report.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The scheme is a named major highway improvement scheme in LTP2, LTP3 and the draft Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy and accords with the aims and objectives to assist the improved management of traffic, provide road safety benefits and support regeneration and economic growth. The improvement supports the aims and objectives of the Traffic Management Act 2004 in reducing congestion and improving the free and safe flow of traffic.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2006-2011.
Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy 2011 – 2026.
Minute No G122 of Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Environment meeting of 18 April 2011.
Local Ward 18 Members

Contact Name:
Ian Ashmore. Principal Traffic Officer, Planning and Regeneration, extension 22825, ian.ashmore@rotherham.gov.uk
5. Summary
The car parking standards currently being used when assessing new development proposals were approved by the Council in August 2002 as interim measures. In view of the time that has passed since then, the parking issues that have arisen at some new developments and the recent change to Government policy, revised car parking standards are necessary.

6. Recommendations

Cabinet Member resolves that:-

i) The attached car parking standards be adopted by the Council and incorporated into the LDF in due course.
7. Proposals and Details
On 3rd January 2011 the Transport Secretary announced the abolition of limits on car spaces for new homes. The revised Council standards now proposed are based on that change in Government policy as contained in Planning Policy Guidance 13 (as amended), Planning Policy Statement 3 (Housing) and Traffic Advisory Leaflet 5/95 (Parking for Disabled People). The major change to the Council’s standards relate to residential parking where minimum rather than maximum standards will now apply. Empirical evidence indicates that levels of car ownership at some residential developments are not related to actual curtilage parking provision such that problems of indiscriminate on street parking can occur to the detriment of convenient access particularly by buses and emergency vehicles. Car parking at non residential developments will continue to be based on maximum standards, some of which are proposed to be slightly modified to accord more closely with Annex D of PPG 13. Accessible parking requirements (previously referred to as parking for the disabled) are updated.

8. Finance
There are no direct financial implications.

9. Risks and Uncertainties
The absence of maximum car parking standards which are consistent throughout the region involves the risk of developers seeking to locate in areas where local authority car parking requirements are less restrictive. Such “perverse” development would not accord with the Council’s policies regarding the promotion of Rotherham’s economic regeneration through sustainable development. Adopting minimum car parking standards at new residential developments could encourage more reliance on the use of the private car. However, in locations of good public transport accessibility or other available public car parking a residential development proposing a level of parking below the minimum standards may be appropriate and will be considered on its merits.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications
The proposed revisions to the Councils Parking Standards accord with the Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy 2011-2026, in particular policy J, which seeks to ‘apply parking policies to promote efficient car use, while remaining sensitive to the vulnerability of urban economies.’

11. Background Papers and Consultation
References: Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 (As amended January 2011)
Planning Policy Statement 3 (Housing)
Traffic Advisory Leaflet 5/95 (Parking for Disabled People)

Contact Name: Ian Ferguson, Highways Development Control Officer, ext 22965, email: ian.ferguson@rotherham.gov.uk
PARKING STANDARDS

April 2011
## Maximum Parking Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Gross floorspace unless otherwise stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1 Food Retail</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 space per 14 sq m&lt;br&gt;Plus accessible parking – see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Food Retail</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 space per 25 sq m&lt;br&gt;Plus accessible parking – see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2 Offices</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 space per 35 sq m&lt;br&gt;Plus accessible parking – see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A3 Restaurants and cafes</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 space per 3 sq m (n.f.s.) of public area or 1 space per 3 seats&lt;br&gt;Plus accessible parking – see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A4 Drinking establishmen ts</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 space per 3 sq m (n.f.s.) of public area or 1 space per 3 seats&lt;br&gt;Plus accessible parking – see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A5 Takeaways</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 space per resident staff + 1 per 2 non resident staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1 Business/Offices</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 space per 30 sq m&lt;br&gt;Plus accessible parking – see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light industry</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 space per 50 sq m&lt;br&gt;Plus accessible parking – see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 space per 200 sq m&lt;br&gt;Plus accessible parking – see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1 Hotels</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 space per bedroom&lt;br&gt; + public drinking/dining areas same as A3&lt;br&gt;Plus accessible parking – see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Institutions</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 space per 2 staff&lt;br&gt; + 1 space per 3 visitors&lt;br&gt;Plus accessible parking – see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C3 Dwellings</strong></td>
<td>1 or 2 bedrooms</td>
<td>1 parking space per dwelling&lt;br&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Standards</td>
<td>3 or 4 bedrooms</td>
<td>2 No. parking spaces per dwelling&lt;br&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flats</td>
<td>1 parking space per flat plus 50% allocated for visitors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The minimum internal floor area for a garage or car port to qualify as a parking space is 6.5m x 3m.

Whilst the above are minimum requirements, consideration will be given to accepting fewer parking spaces if it can be demonstrated that the site is in the vicinity of good public transport links, public car parking, safe and convenient on street parking etc.

| D1 Non Residential Institutions | None | 1 space per 2 staff  
+ 1 space per 15 students  
Plus accessible parking – see below |
| D2 Assembly and Leisure Cinemas and Conference Centres | None | 1 space per 22 sq m  
Plus accessible parking – see below  
1 space per 5 seats  
Plus accessible parking – see below |
| Stadia | None | 1 space per 15 seats  
Plus accessible parking – see below |
| Doctors, Dentists, Vets, etc. | None | 1 parking space per patient consulting  
1 parking space per patient waiting  
2 parking spaces per consulting room  
Plus accessible parking – see below |

**NB**

1. Accessible parking bays are required in addition to the above as follows:

   Employees and visitors to business premises – Individual bays for each disabled employee plus 2 bays or 5% of total capacity (whichever greater.)

   Shopping, recreation and leisure – 3 bays or 6% of total capacity (whichever greater).

   Non residential institutions, medical premises – 3 bays or 6% of total capacity (whichever greater)

   Stadia – 1 bay per 300 seats.

2. A Travel Plan will be required whenever a Transportation Assessment (TA) is required, also in association with developments which involve the employment of more than 25 people or more than 50 visitors per day.

3. Parking bays to be 5 metres x 2.5 metres with a manoeuvring aisle of minimum width 6 metres unless echelon parking is proposed. Accessible parking bays should be a minimum of 3.6 metres wide or 2.4 metres wide with a 1.2 metres wide access/transfer area on at least one side of each parking space and at the same level as the space (or 6.6 metres long and at least 2.4 metres wide if in line spaces are provided).
4. The minimum length of a parking bay between the highway boundary and a garage door to be 6 metres.

5. Visitor parking on shared surface streets within new housing estates will be required in addition to curtilage parking on the ratio of 1 space per 4 dwellings.

6. For Stadia, sufficient coach parking / manoeuvring space will be required within the site for the maximum number of vehicles likely to serve the development at any one time.

7. In town centre and local shopping centre locations, car parking requirements for individual developments will be judged against the level of overall publicly available car parking space in the locality.

8. The above are **maximum** standards apart from C3 residential and accessible parking which are **minimum** standards.

9. Employee and student numbers refer to full time equivalents.

10. Long term and short term cycle parking should be provided in accordance with the Council’s "Cycle Parking Guidelines for New Developments". All cycle parking should be within 30 metres of the entrance to the building and should be sited where they are under continuous observation while in use.
5. Summary

This report outlines the proposed Local Transport Plan (LTP) Integrated Transport Programme for 2011/12.

6. Recommendations

That Cabinet Member resolves to:

(a) note the specific allocation for Integrated Transport for 2011/12 including the carry over from 2010/11.

(b) Agree the principle of the proposed programme as identified in Appendix A as the basis for detailed design and implementation during 2011/12
7. Proposals and Details

My report to the Cabinet Member meeting on 10 January 2011 (minute number 92 refers) outlined the progress made on delivering Local Transport Plan 2 (LTP2) for 2006/11. The report also indicated a likely cut in Central Government funding for LTP3. The capital funding made available from Central Government for Integrated Transport, as part of LTP3, across South Yorkshire is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Allocations</th>
<th>Indicative Allocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011/12 £000's</td>
<td>2012/13 £000's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Transport</td>
<td>11,252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that funding is considerably less than, approximately 50%, that of previous years’ allocations. Funding is granted to the South Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority (ITA) and it collectively decides how this money is split between the partners; Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham, Sheffield and the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTE). At the ITA meeting of the 12th May 2011 partners decided that funding would be allocated in a different way to previous years due to the reduced funding available. It resolved to adopt a ‘whole programme approach’ rather than separating funding into 50% South Yorkshire sub regional stratégic proposals and 50% for the 4 districts as a local programme. The principle of the whole programme approach is that an element of the funding would be still available for South Yorkshire sub regional activity the exact nature of this work is still to be determined. The remainder; £9,400,000, approximately 85%, is split between the partners using the previous accepted formula of 25% to the PTE and the remainder split between the district partners using population numbers in 2006 as its basis. This meant that Rotherham receives an allocation of £1,366,000 to spend on both local and former strategically identified projects such as the A57 improvement. We will also work with the PTE on co-funded projects such as improvements at Mushroom roundabout to maximise the benefit derived from the funding.

We have also an identified carryover of funding of £434,122 for local projects all of which is committed and a further £59,584 of carry over from LTP2 strategic pot identified for public transport accessibility improvements on the A6021 between Broom Lane and Brecks roundabout which is on site and due to complete early June. This gives a total funding allocation for this year of £1,859,706.

Our indicative programme for 2011/12 is attached at Appendix A. This programme shows a balanced budget however at the meeting of the ITA on the 12th May it was agreed that partners should build in an element of ‘over programming’ to a value not exceeding 10%. This would allow partners to be able to deliver their funding allocation should other projects be delayed or not delivered for any reason. As with previous reports it is intended to provide Cabinet Member and advisors with quarterly updates on the programme with regards delivery and expenditure.

It can be seen that our programme of work is not as extensive as in previous years and the reduced budget does restrict scope to undertake additional work. The over programming allows us to manage delivery and it is intended to develop a 4 year programme of works for consideration by Cabinet Member and advisors.
The programme identifies funding of £337,125 from other sources such as developer funding as part of the planning process. It also identifies funding of £595,790 from the SYPTÉ for public transport investment projects and co-funded projects such as the improvements currently on site at Mushroom roundabout.

The programme also identifies areas of work that could lead to future year projects such as studies of traffic flow at Great Eastern Way roundabout together with providing bus priority between the town centre and that roundabout. There are studies identified for the town centre and the roads leading into and around the town centre aimed at easing congestion and improving accessibility by all modes of travel.

The projects identified as local safety schemes will address, where possible, the sites where the greatest number of injury accidents have taken place; effectively a local worst first programme.

8. Finance
The ITA has indicated that £1,366,000 is the minimum that Rotherham will receive as a direct award and that this could increase if the financial value of the sub-regional projects is reduced. The carry over amounts from 2010/11 have been agreed both internally and externally where necessary and these funds are available to spend.

9. Risks and Uncertainties
Due to the relative delay in agreeing how the LTP funds will be allocated in 2011/12 there is the potential for schemes not to be completed before financial year end. The ITA has agreed that districts can manage their own financial programmes and if necessary move funding from one identified area to another.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications
As a means to facilitate various ends, accessibility and high quality transport systems and infrastructure are vital if we are to achieve the aims of the Community Strategies and the Corporate Plan.

11. Background Papers and Consultation
South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 20011-15
Local Transport Plan Capital Programme 2010/11 progress report to Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Development on 10 January 2011 (Minute number 92 refers)

Contact Name:
Andrew Butler, Senior Traffic Engineer, Planning and Transportation, extension 2968, andy.butter@rotherham.gov.uk
## APPENDIX A - Proposed Integrated Transport Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>RMBC LTP Budget</th>
<th>Other funding</th>
<th>PTE Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus Priority and Access Improvement Schemes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotherham - Dearne (South) Key Route</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawmarsh Hill crossing upgrade, carry over from 10/11</td>
<td>access to bus</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Eastern Way/Taylors Lane roundabout, desk top study</td>
<td>bus priority measures</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A633 bus priority from interchange to Taylors lane, desk top study</td>
<td>bus priority measures</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotherham Central Core - Thrybergh Est Key Route</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mushroom roundabout</td>
<td>full signalisation</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzwilliam Road widening, carry over from 10/11</td>
<td>capacity improvement</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellgate/Hotolvigate junction improvement, inc signal maintenance</td>
<td>bus journey time improvement</td>
<td>36,822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldgate Lane junction improvement</td>
<td>bus priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chantry Bridge bus priority past train station inc toucans on A630</td>
<td>bus priority &amp; pedestrian crossing</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other bus projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Safety Schemes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carry over from 10/11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M18/A631 junction, Hellaby</td>
<td></td>
<td>23000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A633 Chain Bar roundabout</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6022 Church St/Station Rd/Bridge St, Swinton</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6089 Stubbins Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Lane safety and accessibility improvements</td>
<td>accessibility improvements</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinngtton Road/Gildingwells Road junction, Woodsetts</td>
<td>junction treatment</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New schemes 11/12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woorygoose Lane junction with Greystones Road</td>
<td>Junction improvement</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A634 Byth Lane, Maltby (Muglet Lane to Stone)</td>
<td>route treatment</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6022 Church St/Station Rd/Bridge St, Swinton</td>
<td>route treatment</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6067 Wood Lane/Treton Lane (High Hazels Road to A618)</td>
<td>route treatment</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional portable VAS for use at community concern sites</td>
<td>VAS</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A633 Parkgate/Rawmarsh (Taylors Lane /bout to Kilnhurst Road)</td>
<td>Refer to bus projects</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A629 Upper Wortley Road (Scholes Lane to Old Wortley Road)</td>
<td>route treatment</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West St/Bacay Way/Doncaster Rd (Melton High St to Gore Hill Ct)</td>
<td>route treatment</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accident Investigation Studies for 2011/12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route and hotspot studies</td>
<td>AIP studies</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>426,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Keep Clear enforcement - roll out to other parts of the borough</td>
<td>TRO</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stag roundabout, carry over scheme from 10/11</td>
<td>Zebra crossings</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickersley Road between Brecks and Stag bus stop improvements,</td>
<td>Bus stop and access improvements</td>
<td>59,584</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit cycling in Clifton Park etc</td>
<td>Revocation of bylaw</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worroygoose roundabout - operation</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherway roundabout - operation</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broom Road outside Rudston school</td>
<td>Public consult and detail design</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Orbital Route</td>
<td>Feasibility study/modelling</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town centre micro simulation traffic model</td>
<td>Modelling</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town centre movement masterplan (RCAT works, cycling through town centre, reversal of town centre ped one way, bus gate on Doncaster Road etc)</td>
<td>Traffic management and package of TRO</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demand Management Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masbrough residents/controlled parking</td>
<td>Ties in with new office and football ground</td>
<td>5,125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellgate North and South Resident Parking - carry over from 10/11</td>
<td>Waiting restrictions</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wath town centre and adjacent areas residents/controlled/disabled parking</td>
<td>Feasibility/Consultation</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>259,684</td>
<td>15,125</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfT CATEGORIES</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>RMBC LTP Budget</td>
<td>Other funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todwick Road Dinnington</td>
<td>Accessibility Improvements</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash Lane Bramley</td>
<td>Footway Crossing</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksoop Road Aston ped refuge to replace pelican</td>
<td>Pedestrian island / S278</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgang Lane Laughton Common</td>
<td>Zebra crossing</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzwilliam Street Swinton</td>
<td>Accessibility Improvements</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Road Catcliffe</td>
<td>Pedestrian Island</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street TC Zebra crossing (developer funded)</td>
<td>Zebra crossing</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A631 Rotherham Road Malby Pedestrian refuge</td>
<td>Pedestrian Island</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhouse Green, Thurcroft</td>
<td>Pedestrian Island</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster Road East Dene phase 3</td>
<td>Zebra crossing and access improvements</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston Comp improvements pedestrian crossing</td>
<td>Carriageway width reduction</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A629 Thorpe Hesley Upper Wortley Road- Outside school</td>
<td>Puffin crossing</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution from traffic signal maintenance</td>
<td>Amendments to existing crossings</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSTF bid</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>183,000</td>
<td>222,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smarter choices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable travel event at Rotherham Show</td>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update/repair to virtual bike</td>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refresh borough cycle map and promote</td>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCAT secure parking</td>
<td>Cycle lockers/parking</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Share Journey time signs</td>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle promotion initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley Travel Plan Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Share Database support</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult cycle training</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Travel Pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Movies Update</td>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY Air Quality Monitoring</td>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>110,500</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Schemes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A57(T) M1 to Todwick Crossroads</td>
<td>Major Scheme</td>
<td>282,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley Link Road</td>
<td>Major Scheme</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT North MSBC development</td>
<td>Development fees</td>
<td>15,790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>582,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAMME TOTALS**

| | 1,859,706 | 397,125 | 985,790 |

**SETTLEMENTS** includes any carry over amounts

| | 1,859,706 | 397,125 | 985,790 |

**REVISED AVAILABLE FUNDING**

| | 0 | 0 | 0 |
1. Meeting: Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Environment

2. Date: 6th June 2011

3. Title: Proposed New Pedestrian Refuges Various Locations; Ward 3 Brinsworth and Catcliffe Ward 9 Maltby, Ward 11 Rother Vale,

4. Directorate: Environment and Development Services

5. Summary
   To seek approval from the Cabinet Member to progress proposals to provide new pedestrian refuge’s at three identified locations within the borough.

6. Recommendations

   Cabinet Member is asked to resolve that

   1. Authority be given for the outline design and consultation to be carried out; and

   2. Subject to receiving no objections to the proposals then the scheme be designed and implemented.

   3. Note that the scheme is to be funded from the Local Transport Plan 3 Integrated Transport programme 2011 /12.
7. Proposals and Details
In view of the limited budget that is available from the Local Transport Plan (LTP) Integrated Transport Programme 2011/12, early investigations have been carried out to determine which scheme proposals can be designed and implemented from within the Connectivity Block (walking and cycling) of this years allocated budget. Specifically, three locations have been identified where it is both desirable and feasible to construct a pedestrian refuge –
A631 Rotherham Road, Maltby (see appendix A)
B6066 Rotherham Road, Catcliffe (see appendix B)
B6410 Woodhouse Green, Thurcroft (see appendix C)

In view of the need to ensure that these schemes are progressed, this report seeks approval for their implementation in principle so that the detail design of each pedestrian refuge can then start with immediate effect. Subject to no objections being received during the relevant consultation periods implementation would commence at the earliest opportunity.

8. Finance
It is estimated that the works will cost approximately £35,000 for each pedestrian refuge with funding being available from the LTP3 Integrated Transport programme 2011/12.

9. Risks and Uncertainties
Statutory Undertakers apparatus will require investigation and this may affect the overall scheme costs should any diversions be required. Furthermore any objections received as a result of the consultation exercise that cannot be resolved will require reporting to a future Cabinet Member meeting which will delay construction on site.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications
The proposed scheme is in line with the Councils’ objectives of achieving safer roads and encouraging walking and also accords with the Equalities Policy.

11. Background Papers and Consultation
Consultation with the Emergency Services, Ward Members, Parish Council and residential frontages affected by the proposals will be undertaken.

Contact Name: Nigel Davey, Engineer, Ext 22380
nigel.davey@rotherham.gov.uk
5. Summary
To seek Cabinet Member approval to provide a new pedestrian refuge adjacent to the Aston Joint Service Centre and to replace an existing Pelican crossing which no longer meets the criteria with a pedestrian refuge.

6. Recommendations

Cabinet Member is asked to resolve that

i. Authority be given for the construction of a pedestrian refuge adjacent to the Aston Joint Service Centre as shown on Appendix A

ii. That the objectors be informed accordingly

iii. Note that the scheme is to be funded by a Developer contribution and from the Local Transport Plan 3 Integrated Transport programme 2011 /12

iv. Authority be given for preliminary design and consultations to be undertaken, to replace the existing Pelican crossing with a pedestrian refuge near Wesley Avenue

v. Note that the scheme is to be funded from the Local Transport Plan 3 Integrated Transport programme 2011 /12 and savings from the traffic signal maintenance budget
7. Proposals and Details

Cabinet Member will recall that consideration was previously given to a report, presented by the Senior Engineer, relating to receipt of an objection to the proposed pedestrian refuge on Worksop Road near its junction with Manvers Road. Cabinet Member referred to his visit to this location and drew attention to the narrowness of the footway and potential difficulties for anyone using a wheelchair or pushchair. A further investigation was requested (Minute 91 of 10/11/2011 refers)

Further consideration has been given to an alternative location adjacent to The Beeches, which was previously rejected due to residents’ concerns about displaced parking and access an egress to The Beeches. A further investigation has determined that a refuge can be accommodated near here but closer to Eden Grove. This repositioning will mitigate the concerns which were raised about a pedestrian refuge in this location.

It is therefore recommended that a pedestrian refuge should be constructed at the location shown on drawing No 126/17/TT151 in appendix A

Consideration has also been given to the existing Pelican Crossing on Worksop Road near Wesley Avenue. The crossing has been in existence for a number of years and the equipment is near the end of its life, and is in urgent need of replacement.

In accordance with Minute 140 of 26/03/2010, a survey was undertaken which established that the crossing was not frequently used and no longer meets the agreed criteria for a controlled crossing. In view of the reduction in budgets and the urgent need to replace the crossing equipment, it is proposed that the Pelican crossing be removed and replaced by a pedestrian refuge. The costs of this would be met by the savings in the traffic signal maintenance budget.

8. Finance

It is estimated that the total works will cost approximately £50,000 with funding being available from the a Developer contribution (£15,000), Local Transport Plan 3 Integrated Transport Authority allocation programme 2011 /12 (£15,000), and savings made from the traffic signal maintenance budget (£20,000).

9. Risks and Uncertainties

Statutory Undertakers apparatus will require investigation and this may affect the overall scheme costs should any apparatus diversions be required.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The proposed scheme is in line with the Councils’ main themes of Alive, Safe and Achieving and also accords with the Equalities Policy.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Consultation with the Emergency Services, Ward Members, Parish Council and residential frontages affected by the proposals will be undertaken. Minute No 140 of 16/03/2010. Minute No91 of 10 /01/2011

Contact Name : Simon Quarta, Assistant Engineer, Ext 54491
Simon.Quarta@rotherham.gov.uk
5. **Summary**

The report proposes that a trial to switch off street lighting for part of the night at a set time be conducted to help reduce energy costs.

6. **Recommendations**

That Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Development Services approves the trial for switching off street lights on the site outlined in this report.
7. Proposals and Details

As part of the street lighting strategy within Rotherham, new technology, products and initiatives are monitored and advantage taken, whenever possible, to reduce the environmental impact of street lighting. In addition, the Council has set a savings target of £35,000 from the street lighting energy budget in 2011/12 to be achieved by switching off selected street lights for part of the night.

In addition to saving energy costs, the effect of the proposal would be to:

- Reduce energy consumption and CO$_2$ emissions; and
- Extend the life of the lamp.

The proposed site for the trial is on Aston Way at Swallownest between Fence roundabout and Chesterfield Road roundabout. There is no footpath along this stretch of highway and therefore should be no pedestrian footfall, however there is a lay-by on this section of Aston Way which will remain lit throughout this trial.

A road safety audit of the highway has been carried out and the police and the council’s legal department will be consulted prior to the initiation of the trial.

It is intended to install a central management system to control the lighting during this trial. If there are any objections or problems during the trial this system is flexible and can revert the lighting back to normal operation. It is also intended to fit signs at the extents of the scheme to inform the public that a trial switch off at set times is to be implemented.

The effect of switching off the lighting between midnight and 6 a.m. will reduce power consumption to zero at that part of the night and on these units will mean a saving in monetary terms of around £25 per unit per annum.

The trial will be monitored and stakeholders consulted on its effect with a view to using the knowledge gained to select other routes where energy consumption can be reduced.

8. Finance

Fitting of the control gear to allow a trial of part night switch off will be accommodated within the capital funds available for the asset replacement and upgrade of street lighting equipment through Local Transport Plan funding.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

There is a risk of public dissatisfaction which may arise from part night switching off of street lighting.

There are associated risks identified in the safety audit, although there are mitigating circumstances as the installation is to be done on a trial basis.
10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Part night switch off of street lighting supports the following Corporate Plan themes:

Sustainable Development – by reducing energy and CO₂ emissions.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Liaison with other Local Authorities that have carried out trials of part night switch off.

Sustainable energy action plan.

12 Contact Name:

Allan Lewis. Principal Lighting Engineer
01709 823069
Allan.lewis@rotherham.gov.uk
1. **Meeting:** Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Environment

2. **Date:** 6 June 2011

3. **Title:** Traffic Management Act 2004 – Permits to Work in the Highway; All Wards

4. **Programme Area:** Environment and Development Services

5. **Summary**

   To report the outcome of the consultation for the introduction of a Permit Scheme for road and street works, and to seek authority to submit an application for a Permit Scheme on the busiest and most important traffic routes in the borough.

6. **Recommendations**

   1. The outcome of the Statutory Consultation be noted
   2. Cabinet Member authorises an application be made to the secretary of State for Transport to implement a permit scheme in Rotherham
7. Proposals and Details

Part 3 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 came into effect in 2007, and allows for the introduction of a Permit Scheme to enable the better management of work activities on the highway. In particular, it aims to improve the ability of local authorities to control and coordinate utility company's street works and its own highway works in order to minimise disruption and congestion.

The scheme provides for a change from the 'notification system' of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. Instead of utility companies notifying the Council about their intention to carry out street works in the borough, they would be required to book road space and time on the highway through a permit, as would the Council for its own works. The Council would choose to grant a permit, apply conditions to a permit or decline permission to work within the highway.

A permit scheme offers a powerful tool for local authorities to co-ordinate and control road and street works, and events. Schemes have recently been introduced in London, Kent, and Northamptonshire. Many local authorities are now actively developing schemes and a national group has been formed to provide advice and support.

The Yorkshire and Humberside Traffic Managers Group convened a working group, the Yorkshire Permit Planning Group (YPPG) to look at the feasibility of providing a permit scheme in the region. Their recommendation was to develop a 'common' permit scheme, which has the same standard provisions when managing works, and targets the main road network throughout the region.

Any authority wishing to introduce a permit scheme is required to apply to the Secretary of State for Transport for approval. An application would not be approved unless it provides a business case that demonstrates that the benefits to the travelling public outweigh the costs of implementing the scheme. The consultants WSP have prepared a cost / benefit analysis for six of the Yorkshire Authorities, i.e. all 4 South Yorkshire Authorities, Leeds and Kirklees. The report shows a positive cost / benefit ratio for Rotherham and each of the other authorities, which includes wider benefits such as reduced financial losses to business, and environmental impact.

In addition to the benefits in terms of reducing disruption on the local road network, local authorities can make a charge for the permit. Utility companies along with other authorities such as the SYPTE would have to pay but there would only be 'shadow charging' for an authorities own works. The cost of a permit is set at a level to enable us to recover the cost of managing the scheme, and the income that we would legitimately recover from the fees should meet any additional costs to the Authority.

Key tasks include the assessment of traffic management layouts, proposed works durations, reinstatement provision, encouraging multi agency coordination, and where necessary consultation.

The YPPG, including officers from Rotherham, invited over 300 consultees (statutory and local) to comment on the Common Permit Scheme between December 2010 and March 2011 for a period of 12 weeks. There have been 186 responses of which 18 were positive, 151 were neutral and 17 were against the scheme received from interested parties such as South Yorkshire Police, South and West Yorkshire PTE’s, and bus companies. The feedback received and the responses made are attached as Appendix A to this report.
Many of the 151 neutral responses, the majority of which were from utilities, were seeking points of clarification in the scheme documentation or permit scheme procedures. The 17 negative responses were primarily received from utility companies not wishing to carry out the few additional tasks that a permit scheme requires. It is the view of the YPPG that no valid reason for not implementing a permit scheme was raised.

Should the scheme be approved, the Yorkshire Permit Planning Group will work with these organisations during the implementation phase, to provide a smooth transition from the current street works noticing arrangements, to the successful launch of the permit scheme. The results of the consultation also highlighted the need to undertake minor amendments to the permit scheme documentation, which has been completed.

The YPPG has developed and updated a project timeline as work on the common permit scheme has progressed. There are factors such as the availability of a Government Minister to sign the final Order that may influence the implementation date. It is anticipated that Rotherham could make an application to implement a Permit Scheme no earlier than September 2011. The DfT require approximately 30 weeks to approve applications, and therefore the earliest that a Permit Scheme would be implemented should be around mid April 2012.

8. Finance

The Department for Transport (DfT) permit fee calculation matrix includes a validation check to determine the number of officers required to work on permit applications and permit conditions vetting for the authority. The additional staff required for processing the permit applications for utility works and works promoted by other authorities will be funded from the permit fees. Permit applications for the councils own works will be processed by the current staff resource. Costs involved in setting up the permit scheme will be recouped from the permit charge income.

To effectively manage the additional tasks of a permit scheme, the DfT permit fee calculation matrix has estimated that an additional 1.6 full time equivalents (FTEs) at salary band H will be required. These FTEs will be self funded by the permit fee income for fulfilling the required tasks through permit application assessments.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The potential exists for utility companies to allocate their resources to focus only on authorities that have adopted a permit scheme. Subsequently, there is a risk of poor coordination and planning of works on Rotherham’s highway network, should a permit scheme not be introduced here. Without the income generated from a permit scheme, the Authority would be both under resourced and under-legislated to drive positive change within utility companies.

Every local authority has a duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004 to manage the traffic on the network in the most effective way. A Permit Scheme would demonstrate that a local authority is taking steps to achieve this. A cost / benefit analysis has been completed which showed it would be appropriate to proceed with a Permit Scheme application. However, where an authority is failing in this duty, intervention can be considered by the DfT. In extreme cases this would potentially lead to the government appointing a traffic director to take over responsibilities for traffic authority operations and guide the Council out of any crisis.
There is a low risk that the Permit Scheme may fail to deliver the predicted benefits outlined in the scheme document and, consequently, there is a slight possibility that the scheme may have to be abandoned or amended. Should the scheme be abandoned, then all works would then be coordinated through the existing notification system, which affords limited powers in dealing with the Council’s own works. Other authorities such as Kent have undertaken a preliminary evaluation of their scheme and are reporting very encouraging early results. A recent letter from Norman Baker (MP), Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Transport encourages other local Authorities to pursue Permit Schemes.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The scheme is in line with objectives set out in the South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 3, where specific note is made regarding the benefits of introducing a permit scheme. The scheme accords with Traffic Management Act 2004 in that it will give greater control over roadworks on the busiest and most important traffic routes in the borough. This will reduce delays and congestion, resulting in reduced carbon emissions and improved air quality. In addition, the proposal supports the clean streets and safer and well maintained roads objectives in seeking an improved environment.

11. Background Papers and Consultation


Appendix A – Consultation Feedback and Responses

Contact Name: Andrew Rowley, Street Works and Coordination Engineer,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Feed Back Type</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Document Section</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.3.4 Measurement of Objectives</td>
<td>Bullet 2 and 3 – ‘when technology becomes available’ – the lack of technology undermines demonstration of the delivery of the objective. How will this be demonstrated in the interim?</td>
<td>The permit scheme is designed to run for many years and provision has been made to allow it to develop as the technology becomes available. In the interim other measures will be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.3.4 Measurement of Objectives</td>
<td>Final Bullet – Please clarify, the statement does not make sense, particularly the context of the final sentence</td>
<td>The aim of the scheme is to provide the best possible service to all users, in reducing the disruption, protecting the infrastructure etc, the competency of officers administering the scheme and of works promoters in submitting permit applications. The bullet point will be re-written to ensure clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.4.5 (2) Registerable activities</td>
<td>Please confirm whether a permit is required for the following activities: Simultaneous opening and closing lids if undertaken at a non traffic sensitive time.</td>
<td>If the works do not involve the use of any form of temporary traffic control as defined in the Code of Practice for Safety at Street Works and Road Works, and/or require a TTRo, or reduce the number of lanes available on a carriageway of three or more lanes then no permit will be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.4.6 (3) Non Registerable activities</td>
<td>Please justify why the Fire Service are able to carry out routine maintenance (testing) of their apparatus without a permit at non traffic sensitive times, yet this opportunity is not extended to Utilities under similar circumstances?</td>
<td>See the answer to 1.4.5 (2) above. The statement in 1.4.6 (3) is to include the Fire Service. This statement is also included in the HAUC(UK) Code of Practice for Permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.4.6 Section 50 licence holders</td>
<td>How will the Permit Scheme affect Section 50 licence applicants as their activities are equally as intrusive and should be subject to the same obligations and conditions as Utility works?</td>
<td>Section 50 works are a registerable activity, however in order to clarify this the document will be amended to insert a second paragraph in section 1.4.4 of the document :- ‘Works to be undertaken under Section 50 of NRASWA on a street covered by this permit scheme will require appropriate permit(s), which will be obtained by the street authority, on behalf of the licence holder.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.4.1 Principles of Coordination</td>
<td>Bullet 3, “…those empowered to take decisions” – this is an obligation that Utilities are unable to meet. Decision makers are unlikely to be in a position to attend coordination meetings, however competent representatives will continue to attend, take away actions and feed back appropriately. Utilities request this section by rephrased accordingly</td>
<td>This is an existing requirement, under 2.2.2 of the Code of Practice for the Co-ordination of Street Works and Works for Road Purposes and related matters which states that “…The key principles of effective co-ordination are regular input and attendance of relevant people (those empowered to take decisions) at co-ordination meetings:’ This requirement is also included in the HAUC(UK) Code of Practice for Permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.4.2 YHAUC</td>
<td>This section seems irrelevant, and should be removed from the permit document</td>
<td>This section of the document reflects the HAUC(UK) Code of Practice for Permits in suggesting that regional HAUC meetings are part of both the performance management and permit dispute process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.6.3 Entering Information into the Register – FPF’s</td>
<td>What does, “…Promoters should send forward planning information about works electronically in accordance with the current Technical Specification for ETOn” mean?………..are FPF’s mandatory? Utilities believe this has been superseded by the YHAUC agreement to communicate long term coordination using the Appendix E spreadsheet.</td>
<td>This section has been included to ensure compliance with the HAUC(UK) Code of Practice for Permits. FPF’s should be used, via ETOn, to complement the long term Appendix E spreadsheet but aren’t a mandatory requirement or a replacement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3.4.1 Access to Register</td>
<td>How will undertakers and partners access the register?</td>
<td>Undertakers will access the permit register through the individual Permit Authorities public website. Address details and user instructions will be made available to undertakers and other interested parties should the Yorkshire Common Permit Scheme be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3.4.1 Access to Register</td>
<td>Will undertakers have access to the full contents of the permits register? (as specified in 3.3)</td>
<td>Work promoters will have access to all current and proposed works on the permit register. ASD information will be available to Works Promoters via the NSG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3.4.1 Access to Register</td>
<td>What back up process and systems will be made available in the event of unplanned down-time to facilitate access to the register?</td>
<td>Each Permit Authority’s IT systems have resilience and Business Continuity Plans in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3.4.1 Access to Register</td>
<td>Please provide details of the back up process requested as above and a proposed service level agreement relating to restoration of service</td>
<td>Each Permit Authority will contact Utilities individually regarding unplanned down time and access to the register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>4.2 Testing</td>
<td>How and who will be testing access to the permits register?</td>
<td>The permit register utilises an amended version of the Street Works Register. The Street Works Register is currently available to view via the councils’ public websites. As part of the implementation plan testing of the permit transmissions will take place between utility and authority systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>4.2 Testing</td>
<td>It is requested that a minimum of one calendar month advance testing (across all Utility EToN systems)</td>
<td>Communication testing will be built into the Permit Scheme implementation plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>4.4.1 (k) Information for the ASD – Vulnerable Road Users</td>
<td>4.4.1 Information for the ASD – Vulnerable Road Users</td>
<td>Permit Authorities will be responsible for ensuring any information held as ASD complies with the Data Protection Act. Information held about establishments or known issues at particular locations will not contain details of any individuals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>5.7 Early notification of Immediate Works</td>
<td>Utilities request clarification on the process for dealing with early notification of immediate works commenced out of hours (please clarify process and contact numbers)</td>
<td>This section is included primarily to future-proof the scheme. If streets are designated within the ASD, the Permit Authority will provide contact details and suitably trained staff to discuss the proposed works with the work promoter, particularly in relation to traffic management and works methodology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>5.8.11 Speed limits</td>
<td>Will the road speed limits be available on the NSG for all Permit Streets from the date of implementation? If not please advise how and where Utilities will be able to access this information.</td>
<td>It is the intention of Permit Authority to hold speed restriction data as ASD. If data is not available at the commencement of the scheme the relevant speed limit can be obtained by contacting the permit authority or by inspecting the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.3 Permit Administration</td>
<td>Please clarify the meaning of, “suitably qualified team of people” – what qualifications and/or experience will individuals have?</td>
<td>Senior managers will ensure that all officers administering the Permit Scheme are suitably trained and qualified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.7 Applications to Interested Parties</td>
<td>What proof of consultation with interested parties will be required, particularly those who do not have access to electronic systems. Does “electronic systems” relate to EToN or a wider interpretation such as email?</td>
<td>The Permit Authority trusts that if a Work Promoter states that it has consulted an interested party it has done so. The Work Promoter can agree an appropriate means of communication with specific interested parties. Should an interested party later complain that it has not been consulted the Work Promoter will be offered the opportunity to demonstrate compliance with the relevant permit condition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.8.1 Additional Information Appendix 1</td>
<td>Utilities request the rewording of final paragraph, “…information that can not be passed via EToN should be sent…using the additional information form referenced in Appendix 1” to read “can be” not “should”. Utilities believe the specific use of the additional information form should be an option, not a requirement.</td>
<td>Agreed, the document will be amended. However all the additional information specified within appendix K must be included in the submission. For consistency it is recommended that the format shown in Appendix K is used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.8.1 Additional Information that can not be processed via EToN</td>
<td>Please clarify whether separate plans and attachments are required for each street as part of a Major Works scheme or could the overall high level area plan be provided instead (which is usually discussed in advance of the works taking place)</td>
<td>Electronic methods should be used. If EToN attachments are not available at the commencement of the scheme, it is suggested that PDF attachments via e-mail would be appropriate for plans/drawings. For consistency it is recommended that the format shown in Appendix K is used. All contact details will be included in Appendix C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.8.5 Immediate Activities Vulnerable Streets</td>
<td>Utilities request clarification on the process for dealing with early notification of immediate on vulnerable streets identified and begun out of hours (please clarify process and contact numbers). How will the logged phone call and unique reference number process be managed out of hours?</td>
<td>Working footprint drawings could be submitted as one high level area plan. Detailed Traffic Management Plans would be submitted per section of street where required, for clarity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.8.5 Immediate Activities Vulnerable Streets</td>
<td>Where would the unique reference number (given following the logged call on identification of Immediate Works on vulnerable streets) be annotated within the Permit Application in EToN?</td>
<td>Please refer to response to Q.16 above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.8.5 Immediate Activities Vulnerable Streets</td>
<td>Utilities request clarification on the process for dealing with early notification of immediate on vulnerable streets identified and begun out of hours (please clarify process and contact numbers). How will the logged phone call and unique reference number process be managed out of hours?</td>
<td>Working footprint drawings could be submitted as one high level area plan. Detailed Traffic Management Plans would be submitted per section of street where required, for clarity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.8.10 Depth - wording</td>
<td>Utilities request rewording of second sentence first paragraph, “While this might be expressed…” to say “may be expressed…”</td>
<td>The HAUC(UK) Code of Practice for Permits uses “might” in ref. 10.14.7 Page 67.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.8.10 Depth - use of Appendix 1</td>
<td>Utilities believe the specific use of the additional information form should be an option, not a requirement</td>
<td>Please refer to response to Q. 20 above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.10.11 Contact Person</td>
<td>Utilities request that the paragraph relating to contact person be amended to include the option of providing a department name or role as an alternative to a specific individuals name (which may not be appropriate or manageable)</td>
<td>This requirement is taken from the HAUC(UK) Code of Practice for Permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.10.12 Early Starts – YHAUC Procedure</td>
<td>Not all Utilities or Street Authorities are in agreement with the YHAUC Early Starts Procedure, how would this be managed as part of the Permit Scheme?</td>
<td>Any reference to the YHAUC Early Start Procedure will be removed from the document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>7.3 Issuing Permits and Response Time</td>
<td>Utilities request a reduction in the application for permit response times from 2 to 1 day for the following activities: Minor Works Notices, Immediate Notices, Variations</td>
<td>Authorities will endeavour to respond back on all permit applications as quickly as possible. The response times in 7.3 of the document show maximum values and any failure to respond to an application within these targets will mean that the permit is deemed granted. Unrealistic response targets would result in a high proportion of deemed permits which would result in a reduction of the quality of the service provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>7.4 Conditions</td>
<td>What local conditions is each authority considering? The local conditions are required be defined and articulated within the permit document to ensure consistency of application.</td>
<td>The framework is set out in the paragraphs following 7.4. There are currently no other ‘local’ conditions in this common scheme, for reasons of consistency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>8.2.4 Applying for a variation</td>
<td>Please define “electronically”…does this mean by ETOn or by wider interpretation such as email? Also the process conflicts with the YHAUC Revised Duration Estimates process.</td>
<td>In this context, electronically means via ETOn, The YHAUC revised duration process will be superseded by the procedures outlined in the Permit scheme document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>8.2.4 (Applying for a variation) Revised Duration Estimates</td>
<td>When agreeing a variation involving an extension in estimated end dates, will this also result an increase in the reasonable period accordingly?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>8.2.5 (a) Multiple Excavations – further excavations new location</td>
<td>“…..the promoter must telephone xx council with the new location”. Please confirm the telephone number to be used (including out of hours) and how the telephone call will be recorded (i.e. logged?). What proof will there be that a call has been made?</td>
<td>Well-established systems are in place for interaction between Street Authorities and Utility Companies with both sides providing call log numbers. The system will be extended to the Permits Scheme. Refer to Appendix C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>8.2.5 Multiple Excavations – openings for simultaneous or ongoing activities</td>
<td>Please refer to number 3 above relating to 1.4.5 (2)…8.2.5 first paragraph, third sentence states, “A series of excavations or openings have to be made from where the symptoms are apparent to trace the point of the fault”. Please distinguish between simultaneous lid lifting (which may not be Registerable if done outside of traffic sensitive times and do not meet the other Registerable criteria) and ongoing lid lifting activities such as venting.</td>
<td>Lid lifting (which may not be Registerable, if done outside of traffic sensitive times, and does not meet the other Registerable criteria) means lifting and replacing lids a few moments later. On-going lid lifting activities such as venting mean leaving lids off for a period longer than a few minutes. This section is unchanged from the HAUC(UK) Code of Practice for Permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>9 Conflict with Other Legislation and Legal Liability</td>
<td>Multiple Excavations – further excavations new location</td>
<td>Please refer to number 3 above relating to 1.4.5 (2)…8.2.5 first paragraph, third sentence states, “A series of excavations or openings have to be made from where the symptoms are apparent to trace the point of the fault”. Please distinguish between simultaneous lid lifting (which may not be Registerable if done outside of traffic sensitive times and do not meet the other Registerable criteria) and ongoing lid lifting activities such as venting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>11.3 Waived and Reduced Fees</td>
<td>Please define “working space” …does this mean the same excavation, or within the same works footprint?</td>
<td>“Working Space” means the same works footprint, not occupying any road space outside the original works: It can also be applied to works using the same lane or road closure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>14.9 Application of Money by XX council (Fixed Penalty Notices)</td>
<td>Please clarify how the Permit Authorities intend to demonstrate that the cost of operating the FPN scheme will be removed from the income received.</td>
<td>The cost of operating an FPN system is not included in the Permit Fee calculation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>15.1.1 Road Closures and Traffic Restrictions - Procedure</td>
<td>Utilities request one consistent advance notice period required in order to process our request for a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (planned works) – please clarify the common lead in period required.</td>
<td>If a TTRO is required, the promoter should notify the traffic authority at least three months in advance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>15.4 Vehicles Parking at Street &amp; Road Works</td>
<td>Utilities request clarification of the purpose of this statement?</td>
<td>This statement is taken from the HAUC(UK) Code of Practice for Permits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>15.7.1 Disruption Effects Score</td>
<td>The Permit Scheme advocates the use of a calculation in Appendix H which is reliant on the provision of traffic flow data. Utilities consider this to be an important evaluation tool and needs to be available at the commencement of the Permit Scheme, therefore clarification on how traffic flow data will be made available is required.</td>
<td>The DES is mentioned in Section 6.10.5 as a means of illustrating an activity where it is significant in terms of potential disruption due to its position and size. It was not anticipated that the DES would be used for the majority of Permit Applications and, so where it was considered that a DES would be of value, the Permit Authority would provide the Works Promoter with such traffic flow information as is available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>15.7.1 Disruption Effects Score</td>
<td>Would failure to provide traffic flow data, as prescribed in the calculation in Appendix H, compromise the objectives of the permit scheme? Utilities consider it would</td>
<td>Please refer to Q.40 above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>16.2.1 Key Parity Measures 1, - include number of deemed applications</td>
<td>Utilities request the definition of measure 1 be amended as follows, “The number of permit and permit variation applications received, the number granted, the number deemed and the number refused”</td>
<td>Whist the Permit Planning Group agree that this is a reasonable request, the KPI is a mandatory requirement specified in the HAUC(UK) Code of Practice for Permits and therefore cannot be amended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>16.2.1 Key Parity Measures 1, - include number of deemed applications</td>
<td>“The number of instances of promoters working without a permit or in breach of permit conditions (to include activities by undertakers and the highway authority) broken down by promoter”</td>
<td>Compilation of the data would be reliant on information from on-site checks, which would not provide complete information. Therefore, this information could not be used as a KPM.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>16.3.1.1 Tangible Benefits - 1 “Minimising delay and reducing disruption to road users from street and road work activity”</td>
<td>Compilation of the data would be reliant on information from on-site checks, which would not provide complete information. Therefore, this information could not be used as a KPM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>16.3.1.1 Tangible Benefits - 1 “Minimising delay and reducing disruption to road users”</td>
<td>Please clarify how the permit authorities intend to demonstrate the benefit claimed in the interim, until technology becomes available.</td>
<td>The regular scheme reviews will highlight the need to address any shortfall in data required to demonstrate whether claimed benefits have been achieved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>47.3.1.1 Tangible Benefits - 2</td>
<td>Please define &quot;apparatus damage&quot;.</td>
<td>Instances where the owner of any apparatus has to attend to repair their equipment after action by another Works Promoter, including when damage is discovered after the event.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>47.3.1.1 Tangible Benefits - 2</td>
<td>Please clarify how you will gather data relating to apparatus damage?</td>
<td>From reports by Works Promoters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>47.3.1.1 Tangible Benefits - 3</td>
<td>&quot;Improved compliance with the Safety at Street Works&quot;</td>
<td>The measures are set out in the scheme document. Works promoters will need to fully plan their operations in order to specify permit conditions in their applications. Improved site compliance will result from a greater ‘involvement’ in these requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>47.3.1.1 Tangible Benefits - 3</td>
<td>Please clarify how the Permit Scheme will improve on site compliance?</td>
<td>The measures are set out in the scheme document. Works promoters will need to fully plan their operations in order to specify permit conditions in their applications. Improved site compliance will result from a greater ‘involvement’ in these requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>49.3.1.1 Tangible Benefits - 3</td>
<td>&quot;Improved compliance with the Safety at Street Works&quot;</td>
<td>Why is only Cat A inspection failures to be measured and not all signing lighting and guarding failures? Sample A inspection failures are an established, agreed means of measuring performance. The Utility Companies will be welcomed if they wish to seek improvements to the way they work and how the scheme is operated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>49.3.1.1 Tangible Benefits - 3</td>
<td>Additional Tangible Benefit request</td>
<td>&quot;A reduction in the number of complaints received&quot; This will be measured across all promoters and compared with benchmark data gathered at the commencement of the permit scheme. The Permit Authorities were mindful of the advice provided by DfT in the Permit Scheme decision Making and Development Guidance. This recommends not setting too many additional objectives which could lead to a scheme design that loses focus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Appendix J Table 3 Permit Fees</td>
<td>Please justify the cost of a variation, also if Sheffield is able to propose variations for Major Works as £20 and £10 for others, how can the remaining authorities justify their rate for all works?</td>
<td>The remaining Permit Authorities have followed the DfT Permit Fee Guidance in establishing the variation fee. The Fee reflects the actual anticipated costs involved in administering the Permit Variations. The Sheffield figure, in particular, will be subject to review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Additional Information Form</td>
<td>Utilities believe the use of Appendix K is unnecessary as all the information contained within the document would be detailed in the Provisional Advance Authorisation or Permit Application and or associated supplementary file attachments</td>
<td>See response to Q.20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Glossary – &quot;Day&quot;</td>
<td>Although the glossary does state the meaning as, “a working day unless otherwise specified” the permit scheme document refers to calendar days in some parts and working days in others. Utilities request one common day format (working or calendar) to avoid confusion. Both terminologies are relevant and required to differentiate separate circumstances.</td>
<td>The document will be amended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Glossary – &quot;Opening (the street)&quot;</td>
<td>Formatting issue, this should be in bold text.</td>
<td>The document will be amended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>General Comments Clash between Customer Service and compliance with the Permit Scheme</td>
<td>Utility organisations provide essential services to both domestic and commercial customers which reside in Yorkshire. These services come at a cost to the customer and it is important that utilities and local authorities are able to demonstrate value for money. In the current economical climate the potential of increasing customer bills as a result of additional costs associated with permit fees and the operation of a permit scheme is of major concern. In respect of value for money, customers expect Utilities to be responsive to service requests. A lack of response leads to dissatisfaction and customer complaints. Utilities operate standards of service schemes, generally agreed with the regulator, and there is concern that the Permit Scheme will further inhibit Utilities from meeting these standards.</td>
<td>The aim of the permit scheme is to minimise the disruption caused by works in the street. An essential part of this is effective planning and execution of works. The scheme will encourage behaviours which provide a better service to direct and indirect customers alike.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>General The need for a Permit Scheme</td>
<td>By advocating the need for a Permit Scheme, do Council Members acknowledge this means that congestion is a problem in each of their permit authority areas? Please justify.</td>
<td>Permit schemes are designed to reduce the disruption caused by works in the Highway. All the Councils in the scheme appointed an independent specialist transportation consultant specialist to analyse the extent of disruption due to works and evaluate the benefits which would accrue from a permits scheme. All schemes will be subject to Council Member approval prior to implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>General The need for a Permit Scheme</td>
<td>By advocating the need for a Permit Scheme, do Council Members acknowledge that attempts to coordinate works and manage disruption have failed under existing legislation? Please justify.</td>
<td>Permit schemes will improve on existing co-ordination arrangements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>General The need for a Permit Scheme</td>
<td>Have all controls and options available in order to coordinate works and minimise disruption under current legislation been exhausted? Please justify.</td>
<td>The Authorities involved in the permit scheme do use all the existing controls in a reasonable manner. The permit scheme further enhances the controls available to reduce disruption and encourages active participation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>General Permit Authority own works and impact on ratepayers</td>
<td>How will the cost of Permit Authority’s own works be funded and what will be the impact on ratepayers’ bills? Please justify.</td>
<td>Internal re-organisations will allow processing of the Authority's own works within existing resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>General Invoicing</td>
<td>Utilities request invoices per works order not by monthly activities as some elements of the overall costs will be paid by customers, contractors or by the Utility. Delays in processing these payments may result in monthly accounts being placed on hold for the sake of one works which may be in dispute. In order to facilitate the speedy and efficient processing of payments, invoicing by works reference will be required.</td>
<td>The National Permit forum is examining this issue and the Yorkshire Permit scheme will follow its guidance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>General NTS Footpaths linked to TS Streets</td>
<td>Please clarify - for works in a footpath (highway for the use solely of pedestrians) which is not traffic sensitive in itself but which is linked to one or more traffic sensitive streets - would a permit be required? The presumption is that the footpath would have a USRN.</td>
<td>The footpath should have a USRN. It would only require a permit if it was designated as a Traffic Sensitive Street (TSS). It is unlikely that such a footpath would be designated TSS because of its link to another TSS. It is possible particularly in the city centre that a highway dedicated for the sole use of pedestrians could be designated as a TSS due to the high volume of pedestrians. The question assumes that there is no footpath of the works on a Permit Street, if that is the case then a notice will be required rather than a permit. However, if works vehicles, spoil, signing and guarding are occupying space on the Permit Street, then a permit is appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 63 | All | Section 50 licences | Please could you confirm how will the permit schemes work in relation to S50 licences? A number of developers currently carry out works under this and our new supplies department have asked for clarification. Will the permit become part of the S50 licence process but with the appropriate additional cost incurred? Clearly they wont have access to EToN either? | Section 50 works are a registrable activity, however in order to clarify this the document will be amended to insert a second paragraph in section 1.4.4 of the document - "Works to be undertaken under Section 50 of NRASWA on a street covered by this permit scheme will require appropriate permit(s), which ill be obtained by the street authority, on behalf of the licence holder."

This is a fundamental change in the way street works are administered.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Comment</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65 Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Isn't this what NRSWA was supposed to achieve?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>What hope do we have of the Permit system working?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Will there be any independent monitoring of the personnel involved in administering the scheme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>What if it doesn't work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>How much has this lot cost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>What will its anticipated cost benefit be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Will its cost benefit performance be measured?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Until I see any improvement in the way that LA's operate, I will remain of the opinion that this is nothing more than an exercise to keep LA staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 Question</td>
<td>Leeds CC Appendix A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intrigued to see Tulip Street and Beza Road included. Together these form a cul de sac off Beza Street. Neither currently have any traffic sensitive status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td>Permit to dig up roads I hope that anyone digging up our roads will be monitored as to the state of the re-surfacing after the work is completed. Not just as the time of completion but up to a minimum of six months after they have finished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 Comment</td>
<td>Rotherham MBC</td>
<td>Non-specific</td>
<td>The Anston Parish Council (Metropolitan Borough of Rotherham) passed a resolution on the 17th January 2011 supporting the proposed Permit Scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 Comment</td>
<td>Kirklees MBC</td>
<td>Non-specific</td>
<td>CONSULTATION ON THE PROPOSAL TO OPERATE A COMMON PERMIT SCHEME IN PARTS OF THE YORKSHIRE REGION AS PER YOUR LETTER 15/12/10 Feedback: PLEASE NOTE THE COMMENTS BELOW COME FROM MELTHAM TOWN COUNCIL'S PLANNING COMMITTEE, (within Kirklees local authority). The Committee feel that the proposed scheme is a good way of improving the present situation in that criteria can be included to control how and when the work is done and this should also allow co-ordination between utility companies so to ensure minimum disruption for road users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>As a Bus Operator involved in operating services through several districts, it would be very beneficial that before granting permits consideration could be given to work being carried out on roads that travel through neighbouring districts as schemes on arterial bus routes can adversely affect bus punctuality. I would support the initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 Comment</td>
<td>Leeds CC 1 &amp; 7 plus overall comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clifford Parish Council wish to make the following comments: 1. The council believe that there is no need to impose an additional layer of regulations. 2. Parish Council should be notified direct, &amp; in plenty of time, if anyone obtains a permit for works inside the parish. 3. It would be useful if future consultations included a summary to make it easier to review. 4. Please let Clifford Parish Council know if any changes are made the document following this consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Why is there no sight of previously submitted questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Permit to Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>General Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6.10.12 - Early Starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7.4.5 Consultation and Publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2.4.3 Co-ordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11.2 Fee Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Rotherham MBC</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15.2 Working Near Rail Tracks and Tramways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Annex G1 ADVICE OF INTENDED WORKS AT OR NEAR A RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Annex G2 ADVICE OF INTENDED WORKS AT OR NEAR A RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Appendix A coverage of permit scheme</td>
<td>Could you please advise what percentage of your network will be covered by the permit scheme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Regarding the response to the first question on S50 licences 1.4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Streets specified as reinstatement categories 3 or 4 which are not designated as traffic-sensitive. Will permits and / or permit fees apply to works on traffic-sensitive streets even if the works take place out of designated traffic-sensitive times?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Information regarding works technique should be sent to the Permit Authority via the additional information form Appendix I. Until this facility is made available through EToN, NJUG believes that trench information could be sent via an EToN note field rather than a separate form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>NJUG suggests that approval for simple shuttle working signals should be given within the permit approval timescales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>NJUG suggests that approval for simple shuttle working signals should be given within the permit approval timescales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>NJUG suggests that approval for simple shuttle working signals should be given within the permit approval timescales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>In relation to the installation of new apparatus - it will not be used to require existing apparatus to be moved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>In relation to the installation of new apparatus - it will not be used to require existing apparatus to be moved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>NJUG is delighted to have been invited to respond to the consultation to operate a common permit scheme in the Yorkshire Region, and hope that the below comments provide constructive feedback on the content of the scheme. NJUG hopes that the comments above assist the Yorkshire Region in finalising its common permit scheme and is more than happy to assist in any further development of the scheme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Permit Authorities will endeavour to ensure that the information contained within the ASD is as accurate and up-to-date as is reasonably practicable.

Utilities are encouraged to use as part of the planning process. Please confirm when the ASD additions (such as speed limits, permit street designation and vulnerabilities and all relevant information) will be available. Assuming the go live date 1 Oct 2011, Utilities will require the up to date ASD information for the September 2011 release. Please confirm the ASD will be up to date with all the additions at this stage.

The Authorities involved in the permit scheme do use all the existing controls in a reasonable manner. The permit scheme further enhances the controls available to reduce disruption and encourages active participation.

In drafting the legislation, the Government will have considered the implications as outlined.

It cannot be assumed that works executed out of hours will not have an effect on traffic. If works do not fall within the definition of "non-registerable activities", as set out in 1.4.5, than a Permit would be required.

See response to Q.8
| Question All | 3.4.1 | Access to Register – how will this be managed to give access to promoters and their supply chains; what systems are in place to: restrict personal information, back-up and restoration time from unplanned events? | See responses to Q.9-12 |
| Question All | 4.4.1(k) - Information for ASD – Other features of the street | Will a testing process be available before implementation to ensure systems are compatible? | See response to Q.13 |
| Comment All | 4.4.1(k) - Information for ASD – Other features of the street | we would expect the information to be complete to aid our planning of the works. For instance, where there's a street with a tram system, school or hospital. This information should be referenced. | Permit Authorities will endeavour to ensure that the information contained within the ASD is as accurate and up-to-date as is reasonably practicable. |
| Comment All | 5.7 – Immediate Activities on streets sensitive to disruption | Immediate Activities on streets sensitive to disruption – we require clear lines of communication, time scales and contact numbers to allow us to put procedures in place operationally. | This section is included primarily to future-proof the scheme. If streets are designated within the ASD, the Permit Authority will provide contact details and suitably trained staff to discuss the proposed works with the work promoter, particularly in relation to traffic management and works methodology. |
| Question All | 6.8.1 – Appendix I (Labelled Appendix K in the document) | this is not mandatory. We would ask the Permit Authority, how information which cannot be passed through EToN, e.g. TM plans to be sent and received and what level of detail is expected? | Agreed, the document will be amended. However all the additional information specified within appendix K must be included in the submission. For consistency it is recommended that the format shown in Appendix K is used. |
| Comment All | 6.10.11 Contact Person | this may mean a department rather than specific person. | This requirement is taken from the HAUC(UK) Code of Practice for Permits. |
| Comment All | 6.10.12 | The Yorkshire HAUC Early start procedure may not meet the needs of companies with operations throughout the UK and the Co-ordination Code should apply in terms of any Early Start agreements. | Any reference to the YHAUC Early Start Procedure will be removed from the document. |
| Question All | 7.4 - Conditions | There are eight Standard Conditions but there is little space on Permit Application for details. How will the Permit Conditions be mapped on the Permit Application to ensure that the level of detail is adequate for the Authority to Grant a Permit and to ensure that the level of detail is still available on site? | Please see section 6.8 of the Permit document. This issue is also being reviewed by the National Permit forum and its guidance will be followed. |
| Question All | 8.2.4 | How do promoters apply for a variation? Is this within EToN Permits or by other electronic means? | In this context, electronically means via EToN. The YHAUC revised duration process will be superseded by the procedures outlined in the Permit scheme document. |
| Question All | 11.3 – Waived and Reduced | this is to be applauded, however please define the “working space” and “joint strategy”. Does a joint strategy include following the same line, one promoter after the other, for instance. How will this work in practice? | With regard to "working space", please see the answer to Q36. With regard to "joint working strategy", this could mean either works promoters working at the same time or sequentially to an agreed timetable. This will work in practice where the strategy is agreed in advance between the Permit authority and the relevant works promoters. |
| Question All | 14.9 – Application of money received | Please define how the Authorities demonstrate that FPN costs are reasonable and that the money received can be segregated from the overall costs of the Permit Scheme. | See response to Q.37 |
| Comment All | 15 - TRRO’s | we would like to see one common lead-in time for processing Orders within the Yorkshire Permit Scheme area for Temporary Orders, rather than individual timings, for operational simplicity. We would expect this to be a “One Stop Shop” in terms of engagement and agreement. Equally if there are dispensations for parking bays, the information must be available to us readily. | See response to Q.38 |
Daily Traffic Flow information sourced from the Highway Authorities must be available to make this workable. How will this data be made available? The DES is mentioned in Section 6.10.5 as a means of illustrating an activity where it is significant in terms of potential disruption due to its position and size. It was not anticipated that the DES would be used for the majority of Permit Applications and, so where it was considered that a DES would be of value, the Permit Authority would provide the Works Promoter with such traffic flow information as is available.

NRSWA defines DAY as the “Working Day” and this must be adhered to. When working out with “Working Days” this must be stated within the Permit Application and Permit itself. FPN’s refers to Calendar Days for the purposes of giving and receiving of a FPN.

We would require that invoices refer to works reference numbers so that we can reconcile each account easily. Monthly invoices would be advantageous. The National Permit forum is examining this issue and the Yorkshire Permit scheme will follow its guidance.

I would like to express general support for the scheme and appreciate that it will assist in stronger communication and coordination of works on the highway network in South Yorkshire and links into West Yorkshire. It is a positive step in South Yorkshire’s ability to manage its network and enable important works to be carried out whilst minimising the adverse temporary impact on all transport and in particular buses. SYPT.

Metro (WTPTT) welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed scheme for Leeds and Kirklees Districts and supports the principle as being consistent with the approach set ou in the draft Third Local Transport Plan. Metro is a public body that provides and maintains transport infrastructure (bus stops/shelters) on the public highway. Metro activities are very minor on average work will take approximately 2-3 hours to complete for the installation of a bus stop pole as such the level of proposed charges will outweigh the actual value of works. Metro believes that there should be a mechanism by which the permit scheme is cost neutral to Metro and does not impose an additional burden on the taxpayer. Metro understands that this reflects the approach that will be adopted for the relevant highway authority. Metro would be happy to engage in further dialogue about the nature of this mechanism. With regard to Permit schemes being “cost neutral”, the HAUC(UK) Code of Practice for Permits provides that fees must be reviewed closely to ensure that the overall income from fees does not exceed the prescribed costs of operating the scheme. The budget for the works described is held by the West Yorkshire PTE and, as such, that operator has to provide the funding for all aspects of their work, including the costs of administration of the Permit Scheme. The Permit Network in each authority area covers the busiest and potentially most congested part of the highway network and tends to coincide with much of the bus operation network. Even short duration works can cause significant disruption on the busier parts of the network and, in the case of PTE type works, can cause significant delays to bus operations. It is essential, therefore, that these works are properly coordinated and controlled; there will be an administrative cost to this necessary part of the Permit Scheme operation. These costs can only be met by the budget holder and works promoter.

The key objective of the scheme is to minimise delay and reduce disruption to road users arising from road and street works activities. What information will be published to establish baseline congestion and disruption figures before the scheme is introduced, and those measured after introduction so that it can be clearly demonstrated if the scheme has met its Key Objective? In developing the scheme, each Authority has undertaken a comprehensive analysis of the disruption caused by Street Works activity. This information will be submitted as part of the application process to the Secretary of State. A post scheme evaluation will be undertaken at an appropriate time.

What information and KPI’s will be published to demonstrate that parity has been applied between Utilities and Authorities? Section 16.2.1 sets out the KPI’s that will be reported under the Permit scheme and, as set out in 16.2, these will apply to all works promoters.

Can we be assured that there is a robust process in place to ensure that the Traffic sensitive designation is appropriate after any changes to the criteria? There is currently no maximum (or minimum) time period for reviews under this section. It is not appropriate to set a timescale for reviews as these will be dependent on changing circumstances within each Permit Authority’s road network.

Is it the intention for each Authority to fully comply with the Code of Practice in relation to providing information under the provisions of S58? Yes

Can we be assured that there is a robust process in place to ensure that the Traffic sensitive designation is appropriate after any changes to the criteria? Yes

Will a Permit be required the opening of a footway of a Permit street (“venting”)? Please see response to Q. 3

Can each Authority provide details of those streets requiring Early Notification of Immediate Activities? Please see response to Q. 16
135 Comment All 6.8.1 and 6.10.6 Due to the volumes of Permits likely to be involved, we do not believe that Appendix K is workable. We believe a suitable alternative would be to include any additional information in the Notice Text. (NB – Appendix K is incorrectly referenced as Appendix I in the body of the report).

136 Comment All 6.10.11 There is no current method of providing multiple contact details to include both daytime and out-of-hours contacts – our working practices do not allow for a single individual to be the nominated contact 24/7 through the duration of a work activity, and it may be that a generic contact would be provided for out-of-hours. This requirement is taken from the HAUC(UK) Code of Practice for Permits.

137 Question All 6.10.3 Does the “Workspace” include advance warning signs including signs that may be on “the approach” streets which may not be included in the Permit? Such signs would not be included in the dimensions of the space taken up by the activity in the street. However details of their location would be required to fully assess the traffic management of the permit application.

138 Question All 6.12.4 third paragraph Where an activity is interrupted at the instigation of the Authority and a Variation / further Permit is required to complete the activity, will these be issued at zero cost? Also, will the details (numbers) of the Variation / further Permit be made available at the time? Section 11.3 sets out the circumstances in which a fee would be waived. Section 11.4 provides that no fee to vary or replace a permit where the Permit authority varies a permit through no fault of the works promoter. The numbering of the variation will conform to that set out in the EToN Technical Specification.

139 Comment All 7 Our assumption is that, in the context of the permit scheme the “working day” will remain as 08:00 – 16:30. Please confirm if this assumption is correct. Working day is as defined in Section 98(2) of NRSWA

140 Question All 6.14 Error corrections are currently requested via ETON. Our assumption is that, under a Permit scheme, a contact at the Authority will be available to discuss the details by ‘phone. Please confirm if this assumption is correct. Please see response to Q. 29

141 Comment All 7.3 Table 1 We believe that the response time for Minor and Immediate works including variations should be reduced to 1 day having consideration for the short notice periods of these activities. Please see response to Q. 29

142 Comment All Section 7.4.6 (and more generally as an overall principle) Any Permit conditions imposed should not conflict with other conditions or restrictions imposed or enforced by another section in the Authority. It is expected that any special requirements, imposed by any other section of the Authority will be included by the promoter in their application.

143 Comment All 7.1.7 first bullet point We believe that the word “not” has been accidentally omitted; i.e. the bullet should read “In relation to the installation of new apparatus – it will not be used to require existing apparatus to be moved”. Agreed. Please see response to Q. 96

144 Comment All 6.10.8 first line We believe that the word “best” should either be removed or replaced with the word “reasonable”. This requirement is taken from the HAUC(UK) Code of Practice for Permits.

145 Comment All 7.12 Our assumption is that the grounds for refusal can only relate to conditions specific to the relevant Permit application. Please confirm if this assumption is correct. Please see response to Q. 95

146 Question All 8.2.3 and Section 11 How will a frequent Works Promoter (e.g. a utility) be advised of and invoiced for fees? At what frequency will these be provided? What information will be provided to allow reconciliation of the invoice to individual permits, and to allow for alignment of related PAAs, Permits and Variations? Invoicing arrangements will be discussed as part of the implementation plan of the Permit Scheme.

147 Comment All 8.2.5 (specifically sub- paragraphs a and c). For a Utility operating an Emergency Service we believe that these proposals are not practical. Consideration could be given to a contact for each 50m band, but to bring in this requirement for every additional excavation carried out in each band is unreasonable and, we believe, unworkable. This requirement is taken from the HAUC(UK) Code of Practice for Permits.

148 Comment All 11.3 Please clarify whether, to qualify for waived fees, if the agreement can be made after the PAA has been submitted. If this is the case, will the PAA fee also be waived? Agreements for workspace sharing or joint working can be made after a PAA has been submitted. However, if the Permit authority has already granted the PAA then that fee is still chargeable as the authority has already incurred costs in considering and granting the application.
149 Comment All 9 fourth paragraph. Please provide clarification of the scope, purpose and limits of this paragraph.

The clause is similar to those found in many agreements and contracts. Any disagreement will have to be resolved through the dispute resolution procedure.

150 Comment All 12.7 & 12.9 We believe that references to NRSWA Section 74(SC) should read NRSWA Section 74 (SC).

Agreed, the document will be amended.

151 Question All 12.5 We understand that, in cases where it is not initially possible to reach agreement on a “Reasonable Period” and the Authority imposes a period shorter than that requested, it will be necessary (should a longer period be agreed following discussion or dispute resolution) for a Permit Variation to be applied for. In these cases, we believe that the Variation should not attract a charge. Please confirm if this assumption is correct.

The fee for a Permit variation would be charged but would then be subject to the outcome of the dispute resolution process as set out in section 10.3.

152 Question All 16.3.1.1 Will the information provided for “tangible benefits” include data and figures for the Authority’s works also?

Yes

153 Question All 16 How will information relating to the impact of the Permit scheme be collected and disseminated? Please clarify the means and frequency of information relating to performance (KPIs), including those relating to the performance of the Highway Authority.

The Permit Scheme is being developed to operate over many years, so it is appropriate to include measures which will be developed during the life of the scheme. Information will be sent out in line with the current YHAUC Summary of Performance reporting, and will be taken from the Permit Register, where available, otherwise alternative arrangements will be made to obtain information. Performance measurement will apply equally to all promoters' works, as set out in 16.2.

154 Comment All 15.7 do not believe that this section is practicable and, with the information available to us, we are not able to operate within this requirement. We would request that this section is removed or revisited.

This requirement is taken from the HAUC(UK) Code of Practice for Permits

155 Question All 6.3.1.1 Benefit claimed 2 How will “… the number of reported apparatus damages caused by the activity promoter” be established?

Please see response to Q. 48

156 Comment All General On behalf of the Highways Agency, I fully support the common permit scheme, as I believe it will bring benefits to all the authorities participating and more importantly it will benefit all road users in those local authority areas where it is introduced. One of the particular benefits for the Highways Agency will be the requirements imposed on the statutory undertakers will be more in line with our own requirements and will make it easier for us to get the statutory undertakers to comply.

157 Comment All General National Grid is pleased to be invited to comment on the Yorkshire Common Permit Scheme (YCPS) and after careful analysis of the document the following comments and areas for further clarification have been identified.

The Department for Transport require a separate Scheme for each authority unless part of a 'Joint' Scheme operated by one administrative organisation on behalf of more than one Highway Authority.

158 Comment All General It was noted that each Street Authority has produced a separate copy of the scheme, all of which slightly differ in presentation. On further investigation it was identified that there was no difference in the contents of the scheme documentation apart from the differing Permit fee’s matrix for each authority. Thought should be given to scoping a single document with the differing fees matrix as an appendix. This would have a practical benefit for promoters such as National Grid who work in several of the authority areas within YCPS and would alleviate the need to refer to several documents.

Permit Authorities have followed the DfT Permit Fee guidance in calculating their permit fees, and are required to have them certified as part of a submission to the Secretary of State to operate a permit scheme.

159 Comment All General In respect to the matter of the permits fees, it was of interest to National Grid to understand how the authority specific fees’ have been derived as there was no cost benefit analysis available with the documentation to explain the differing fees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Comment</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>160 Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Appendix A contains a list of streets that are included in the scheme. National Grid welcomes the inclusion of such information but would welcome clarification on the process to be followed if the street information changes from that published in the document. The potential for change from the published list must be high and as such would recommend that the future listing be published on a website to help stop any possible errors with old data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161 Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.4.3.</td>
<td>National Grid was pleased to see that the Scheme only applies to 0, 1, 2 and Traffic Sensitive (T/S) routes. Clarity is required for work undertaken within the T/S area but at a non-traffic sensitive time – what applies and can EToN facilitate/differentiate between requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162 Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.4.3.</td>
<td>Clarity is sought as to what information will be shared at the regular performance meetings meetings. Does this relate to the KPI’s discussed within the document? Does this fall in line with those proposed at the National Permit Forum?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163 Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2.6.3</td>
<td>The sending of forward planning information via EToN is a non-mandatory requirement as per the EToN technical specification. Whilst National Grid agrees that data should be easily transferable the impact on the promoters' administration costs and processes must be taken into consideration. If this process is to be followed National Grid would ask that a full trial and costs benefit analysis is carried out before this is included in the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>The Northamptonshire Permit Scheme ‘switch’ for the transfer of noticing authority to permit authority was handled very successfully between all promoters and Northamptonshire. We would recommend that authorities within YCPS contact Northamptonshire to discuss the best practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165 Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>5.2.3</td>
<td>Consideration should be given to statutory undertakers’ legislative obligations regarding both Emergency works and customer requests for new supplies due to our obligations under our operating licence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166 Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Will the streets requiring early notification by phone be identified on the ASD/NSG?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167 Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.1.2</td>
<td>How does the Permitting Authority propose to attach conditions that are not mandatory within the scheme i.e. Local conditions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168 Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>The EToN technical specification stamps the Permit. Notice when a connection has been made between web services and the batch file has left the promoters system rather than when a Permit Authority receives the batch file. How will YCPS deal with those files that fail to load onto the YCPS EToN systems but which can be clearly demonstrated to have left the promoters systems?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>How would a promoter identify a Section 50 license holder undertaking works as they are exempt from the Permit Legislation? It is a duty of the Permitting Authority to co-ordinate works and respond accordingly to each promoter of impending works where that promoter does not have access or use the Eton system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.8.5</td>
<td>Clarification is sought on the permitting process required to reinstate supplies after an emergency repair has been completed. Once a supply has been isolated the Emergency would effectively end – would further works (restoration of supply etc) require an additional permit even though the works would normally be completed within 24 hours within the same excavation? This could subject the works promoter to double permit costs which would be unreasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 16</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>7.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>7.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>8.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a national company we need to follow a single approach and will therefore follow the early start procedure as per the NRSWA CoP para 8.3.9 whereby the works promoter submits a notice with the proposed start and finish dates required.

Network Rail will only receive FPNs via post sent to the Group Company Secretary, Kings Place, 90 York Way, London, N1 9AG. Network Rail takes seriously any situation that incurs any form of penalty. Network Rail is also a national company with a significant geographical spread. It is therefore appropriate that we follow the good business governance by having legally enforceable penalties go to a single point of entry and that the point is our Legal Services function.

South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTEx) welcomes and supports the scheme as proposed within the Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield districts as a further means of minimising the potential disruption to traffic from street works in these areas. Roads are recognised in the emerging Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy (SCRIS) as being an important part of the transport system, with a vital role in supporting the local economy. Reducing congestion and delays on the key regional roads is identified as a strategic challenge within the SCRTS and this proposed scheme should play a significant part in addressing the achievement of this challenge.

The Yorkshire Joint Authorities Group has agreed the status of Passenger Transport Executives as Transport Authorities under the National Roads and Streetworks Act and it has confirmed this status with respect to any proposed permitting scheme.

SYPTEx acts as a works promoter for the on-street operations that it manages and controls as part of its role e.g. the management and development of the stop, shelter and the public transport information facility network in South Yorkshire. If the proposed scheme goes forward, permits will be sought for all relevant works that are promoted by SYPTEx. Integrated Transport Authorities are responsible for producing and co-ordinating Local Transport Plans (LTPs) within metropolitan areas. It is these LTPs that provide the funding for local delivery and the maintenance of transport infrastructure on-street, the funding going to Districts or PTEs as appropriate. In this, the PTEs are in effect acting on behalf of the Highway Authorities and it would not be appropriate for the PTEs to be charged Permit Fees for their works on-street. Accordingly, SYPTEx will not expect to be charged Permit Fees and as a result for there not to be any resulting cost to local taxpayers.

A fundamental part of the operation of this Permit Scheme is that the funding of the administration of permits for works by promoters other than the Highway Authorities themselves must be met from the fee income from the promoters of those works. The South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive holds the budget for all works carried out by that organisation and as such meets all costs associated with those works. The costs associated with the approval of permits for any SYPTEx works on the Permit network cannot be met from the Highway Authority revenue budgets and will be an appropriate charge against the promoter who holds the budget for these works, i.e. the South Yorkshire PTE.