

North Yorkshire County Council
Network Information & Compliance

**The North Yorkshire
Streetworks Permit
Scheme**

**Year 2 Permit Scheme
Evaluation Report**

July 2023

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

Report Date	July 2023
Project Name	Year 2 Permit Scheme Evaluation Report
Service Area	Highways Network
Directorate	Network Information & Compliance
Author	Jason Setford-Smith, Scheme Consultant
Project Lead	Allan McVeigh, Head of Highways Network Strategy
Version	3 rd DRAFT

We're committed to making our documents as accessible as possible so they can be read by as many people as possible.

This document has been produced with accessibility in mind and has been checked for accessibility before publication.

Any source data that cannot be effectively presented in a suitable format has been supplied in a separate source data document.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DOCUMENT INFORMATION	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
PERMIT SCHEME COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS RESULTS	4
PERMIT SCHEME PERFORMANCE REPORT	5
DEVELOPING THE PERMIT SCHEME	8
APPENDIX 1 - EVALUATION BACKGROUND.....	9
APPENDIX 2 - KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DATA	14
KPI 1 - THE NUMBER OF PERMIT AND PERMIT VARIATION APPLICATIONS RECEIVED, THE NUMBER GRANTED, AND THE NUMBER REFUSED.	14
KPI 2 - THE NUMBER OF CONDITIONS APPLIED BY CONDITION TYPE.....	29
KPI 3 - THE NUMBER OF APPROVED EXTENSIONS.....	31
KPI 7 - NUMBER OF INSPECTIONS CARRIED OUT TO MONITOR CONDITIONS	31
HAUC TPI MEASURES.....	34
AUTHORITY MEASURES.....	41
APPENDIX 3 INCOME AND COSTS.....	54
AVERAGE PERMIT COST AND COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS.....	55

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The North Yorkshire Permit Scheme (NYPS) was introduced on 7th February 2018 and this report covers the second year from the 1st April 2019 to 31st March 2020.

The purpose of this report is to evaluate the impact of the Permit Scheme, its operational performance and give consideration to the fee structure, the costs and benefits of operating the scheme and whether the Permit Scheme is meeting key performance indicators where these are set out in the Guidance.

The Permit Scheme is not intended to prevent activities necessary for the maintenance or improvement of the road network, or the services running underneath it.

It is designed to make available the necessary resources to achieve an appropriate balance between the interests of the various parties and where possible, bring about effective co-ordination between all the different competing interests.

There are a wide range of indicators and measures that the industry has been discussing and agreeing that should be reported on.

Some of these are possible to report on and some require further work or system changes to prepare. This evaluation identifies all the indicators and measures agreed by the industry and various representative groups.

Although some data is not available currently, the requirement and format has been documented in this evaluation so that it can be identified easily and worked on over following years.

When the NYPS was being developed, a Benefit to Cost Ratio was prepared using predicted costs and volumes of applications and an DfT assumed 5% reduction in works impact.

Now there are actual costs and actual works volumes, this has been rerun using the same DfT 5% assumed reduction in works impact, base line societal costs of works and today's actual scheme operating costs and volumes.

PERMIT SCHEME COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS RESULTS

Year 1 Costs £1,364,004	Year 1 Benefit £7,448,220	Year 1 Benefit to Cost Ratio 5.46:1
Year 2 Costs £1,370,772	Year 2 Benefit £6,899,760	Year 2 Benefit to Cost Ratio 5.03:1

PERMIT SCHEME PERFORMANCE REPORT

It is important to note that although the industry has agreed on the various data sets that a Permit Scheme evaluation report should contain, the various IT systems used by the industry to record all the operational communications and record keeping etc, not all the data is actually recorded or available to be reported on.

This has resulted in some gaps and anomalies in the data seen below and throughout this report. This situation is resolving itself, resulting in increased data allowing increased analysis and management focus.

During years 1 and 2 of operation of the Permit Scheme, Permit applications received from Utility Promoters and Highway Authority Promoters has grown from an average of 2,955 per month to 3,194 per month, an 8% increase.

This total includes applications that were granted but subsequently cancelled by the Promoters before the works were undertaken.

On average, 67% of applications were from Utilities, and 84% were granted.

On average, 33% of applications were from the Highway Authority and 90% were granted. Internal applications are expected to be granted at a slightly higher rate as they are from within the organisation.

During year 1, 20 applications Deemed, which is automatically granted due to no response by the permit team. In year 2, 60 applications Deemed which for the second year is a remarkable small number considering the total volume of applications. It should be noted that this can be a system issue due to application being received for Private Streets which cannot be responded to.

Permit Variation volumes have grown each from an average of 1,242 per month in year 1 to an average of 1,578 per month in year 2, which is a 27% increase.

Varying Permits as opposed to refusing them is an effective co-ordination process demonstrating a dialogue between the Permit Team and Promoters to ensure the works cause the minimum disruption possible. Substantially high volumes of Variations is seen across the industry now that the process managing Permits is better understood and being delivered.

The average individual Permit cost over the 2 years was £34.50. This is a low figure compared to what the consultant sees across the industry. The expected range is £50 to £70. This is due to the lower Permit fee than the maximum available being charged.

Collaborate works have been delivered with 122 recorded in year 1, 228 recorded in year 2.

There is a relatively consistent number of Permit breaches over the 2 years at an average of circa 200 per month. Breaches can be from a failure to comply with requirements to give notice of completion of reinstatement to working without a Permit. This needs ongoing monitoring and robust feedback to promoters so improvements can be worked on. The impact and effectiveness of the Permit Scheme is reliant on compliance with legal requirements, so this is a critical area to maintain focus on.

There is a consistent number of Permit Conditions attached to Permits at an average of 4,379 per month in year 1 and 4,859 per month in year 2. This is a clear indication of the effectiveness of the Permit Scheme.

Inspections to monitor compliance with the Conditions attached to granted permits has been consistently growing and is now at 983 per month up from 816 per month

in year 1. This is a very robust number and a credit to the team. Again, the impact and effectiveness of the Permit Scheme is reliant on compliance with Conditions, so this is a critical area to maintain focus on.

ISSUES

Early response to COVID-19 and the ramping up of the Broadband rollout has impacted the industry enormously over the past year. However, the North Yorkshire Permit Team's ability to deliver the full range of permit functions during this period of turmoil is an outstanding achievement by the whole team and their managers. The year have seen ongoing management and operational improvements across a range of measures, detailed above and in the tables below.

The IT system's ability to produce reports consistent with the industry's agreed indicators and measures has been a major problem, however, improvements can already be seen.

Historically, the industry has agreed on a range of reports that none of the system providers have been able to produce. The central government initiative to develop a new single central IT system called Street Manager is replacing current providers and will hopefully clarify KPI and management reporting requirements in future years.

STAFF

The Permit Scheme staffing level has been maintained to manage the volume of application received.

The Permit Scheme is fully resourced, and this is expected to continue.

OPERATIONAL COSTS

Operational costs have been lower than revenue to maintain a positive balanced position.

However, costs are rising and are expected to continue to rise. Therefore, over the next 2 to 3 years a loss position is expected to arise unless costs are capped to income.

CONCLUSIONS

This report provides evaluation findings of key indicators and measures for the North Yorkshire County Permit Scheme after its first 2 years of operation.

The Consultant rates the North Yorkshire County Permit Scheme as **Excellent**.

One of the most impressive achievements is that Permit applications have been effectively managed and inspections undertaken during the past 2 years whilst volumes have risen and the initial impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic were seen, presenting unique challenges.

Deemed Permits (automatically granted when not assessed by the Permit Team) has remained statistically insignificant.

The Permit Scheme has been delivered very well with consistent delivery by management and the team year on year.

The team consistently co-ordinate all road and street works in North Yorkshire County and take the time to review every application and apply conditions to minimise the impact of the works on the users of the network.

Income is expected to be lower than scheme operational costs in future years.

Additional staff may also be required to manage expected increases in application volumes and Utility undertakes. Therefore, there is a need to consider an adjustment (increase) in fee rates in future years to ensure costs and income are balanced over the coming several years.

There are still some difficulties gathering accurate data from the IT system, but this has improved, and it is expected to continue to improve over the following years.

The Permit team and Promoters will continue to work together and make improvements to minimise the impact of works on the highway network.

Works are being Permitted and co-ordinated effectively against a backdrop of an unprecedented international pandemic and the rollout of a major fibre broadband initiative.

The entire network is being managed to the best of the team's ability with the tools and resources available to them and is a considerable achievement and worthy of praise.

LOOKING FORWARD

The Permit Scheme will continue to maintain its effectiveness over the following years with a focus on these key areas.

- Monitor income and costs and consider increasing Permit Fees to the maximum level to maintain a balance between operational costs and fee income in future years.
- Work with Promoters to reduce breaches and ensure compliance with legal requirements.
- Monitor the DfT's Street Manager system implementation and feedback the need to improve data recording and reporting.
- Continuing staff recruitment, training, and development to maintain the required staff levels and skills.

DEVELOPING THE PERMIT SCHEME

During 2017 and after an initial high-level financial assessment, consideration of the local needs and discussion with internal stakeholders, operational partners, consultants and neighboring Highway Authorities, North Yorkshire County Council decided that the most appropriate scheme for North Yorkshire is one that would operate on all streets and charge a fee for Granted Permits on all streets.

Permit fees were set below the maximum level set by the DfT to ensure an initial balance of fee income and costs.

The North Yorkshire Permit Scheme has been designed to assist the Council to manage the existing local road network for the benefit of all road users.

The Permit Scheme will support existing activities and priorities of the Council and will provide a positive benefit. The Scheme will also encourage the undertakers, including those working for and on behalf of the Highway Authority to work in collaboration.

The Permit Scheme has been operationally and proactively focused on Strategically Significant Streets and to further the overall cultural shift to better management of the network.

However, co-ordination of all activities on all streets will be undertaken to deliver effective and proactive management of the entire network and consider the needs of all highway users and stakeholders such as local community bus operators.

Lower fees will be charged for activities on non-traffic sensitive streets and category 3 and 4 roads.

PERMIT SCHEME OBJECTIVES

The scheme's objectives are as follows:

- Improve the quality and timeliness of information received from all activity promoters.
- Encourage a proactive approach to planning and undertaking of works on the highway.
- Protect the structure of the street and the integrity of apparatus in it.
- Ensure the safety of those using the street and those working on activities that fall under the scheme, with particular emphasis on people with disabilities.
- Ensure parity of treatment for all activity promoters.
- Reduce any unreasonable occupation of the Highway through efficient coordination and to minimise the impact of works on the travelling public.

The scheme is set up as a Red, Amber, Green (RAG) rated system, which works on a first come first serve basis in terms of booking road space.

Once a permit is submitted via the electronic system, a response time is automatically calculated according to the response times as set in statute.

The team then assess the permits according to the priority as determined by the response times.

KEY SCHEME OBJECTIVES

The key objective of the North Yorkshire Permit Scheme is to support the continued delivery of transport objectives that contribute to the priorities of reducing congestion, improving safety, accessibility and air quality.

In addition, the permit scheme will support achieving economic growth and help deliver the wider County, Regional and National Agendas whilst still supporting delivery of sustainable transport objectives and continuing to listen and take into account the needs and views of all transport users in the County.

IMPROVING PERFORMANCE

All Permit Schemes have underlying objectives to improve performance in line with the Authority's Network Management Duty in relation to the following key factors:

- Enhanced co-ordination and co-operation
- Encouragement of partnership working between the Permit Authority, all Activity Promoters and key stakeholder groups identified within this document
- Provision of more accurate and timely information to be communicated between all stakeholders including members of the public
- Promotion and encouragement of collaborative working
- Improvement in timing and duration of activities, particularly in relation to the busiest streets within the network
- Promotion of dialogue with regard to the way activities are to be carried out
- Enhanced programming of activities and better forward planning by all Activity Promoters

APPENDIX 1 - EVALUATION BACKGROUND

PERMIT SCHEME EVALUATION

Swift Argent Ltd was commissioned by North Yorkshire County Council in 2023 to evaluate the performance of the Permit Scheme as a requirement set out in The Traffic Management Permit Scheme (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 regulation 16A.

The NYPS was implemented on 7th February 2018 and the purpose of this report gather and analyse data and to evaluate the Permit Scheme and consider the fee structure, the costs, and benefits of operating the Scheme and whether the Permit Scheme is meeting key performance indicators where these are set out in the Guidance.

SCOPE OF WORK

In order to evaluate the performance of a Permit Scheme a number of data items are required to enable analysis.

Data is available within the street works IT system along with financial information from the Authority finance department.

The individual data items are set out later in this report for each indicator but will include the following categories.

- Number of Permits granted, modified, refused and varied
- Parity of treatment between Utilities and Authority works
- Conditions attached to Permits and breaches
- Variations and extensions and early starts
- Inspections carried out and results
- Works durations
- Customer enquiries
- Permit fees
- Operational costs
- Societal benefits

REPORT STRUCTURE

- Executive Summary
- Cost Benefit Analysis
- Permit Scheme Performance
- Evaluation Background
- Key Performance Indicator Data
- HAUC TPI Measures
- Authority Measures
- Costs and Income

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

A set of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and Objective Measures (OMs) are set out below to demonstrate parity of treatment between works for road purposes and street works undertaken by statutory undertakers.

Section 20.3 of the Permits Code of Practice states that every Authority that wants to run a Permit Scheme must explain how it intends to demonstrate parity of treatment for promoters in its application.

The Code contains seven KPIs that could be used for this purpose. The recording of KPIs 1 and 2 is a mandatory requirement of all Permit Schemes.

Authorities should select at least two others which they consider will demonstrate parity across their Permit Scheme. Authorities can also include their own KPIs.

- KPI 1 The number of Permit and Permit variation applications received, the number granted, and the number refused. (Breakdown of the data into applications granted and refused in relation to highway authority works for road purposes and works by utility promoters and provide a comparison with the percentage of Permits granted. Also, the data is further broken down by activity type into applications granted and refused.)
- KPI 2 The number of conditions applied by condition type.
- KPI 3 The number of approved extensions
- KPI 4 The number of occurrences of reducing the application period (early starts).
- KPI 5 The number of agreements to work in Section 58 and Section 58A restrictions. (Details of Section 58 and 58A restrictions will be provided as required under Section 8.3 of the TMA Code of Practice for Permits.)
- KPI 6 The proportion of times that a Permit authority intervenes on applications
- KPI 7 Number of inspections carried out to monitor conditions

The Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes October 2015 set out TMA Permit Indicators (TPIs) for Permit Schemes are additional to the general TMA Performance Indicators, which are already being produced. The TPIs focus on occupancy, co-ordination, and inspections, and there for relate mainly to the stages of the works from works start to final conclusion. These additional Permit indicators focus more on the process of Permit applications and responses, prior to the works being carried out.

- TPI1 Works Phases Started (Base Data)
- TPI2 Works Phases Completed (Base Data)
- TPI3 Days of Occupancy Phases Completed
- TPI4 Average Duration of Works Phases Completed
- TPI5 Phases Completed on time
- TPI6 Number of deemed Permit applications
- TPI7 Number of Phase One Permanent Registrations

In addition to DfT KPIs and HAUC TPIs. The authority can collate its own data. These measures should reflect the business case and objectives put forward in the Scheme submission documentation.

- AM 1 Average duration of works by Permit type (Included in report)
- AM 2 Inspections (% age of total undertaken and failures) (Included in report)
- AM 3 Days of Disruption Saved/ Number of collaborative works (Included in report)
- AM 4 Response Code – broken down by promoter (Included in report)
- AM 5 FPNs (Permit Breaches) (Included in report)
- AM 6 Levels of Customer Enquiries (Included in report)
- AM 7 Average Journey Times
- AM 8 Journey time reliability
- AM 9 Road Traffic Collisions
- AM 10 Carbon Emissions
- AM 11 Profit/Loss (Included in report)

TABLE 1 PERMIT FEE RATES

Provisional Advance Authorisation	Road Category 0-2 or Traffic-sensitive £98	Road Category 3-4 and non-traffic-sensitive £31
Major works – over 10 days and all major works requiring a traffic regulation order.	Road Category 0-2 or Traffic-sensitive £200	Road Category 3-4 and non-traffic-sensitive £54
Major works – 4 to 10 days	Road Category 0-2 or Traffic-sensitive £130	Road Category 3-4 and non-traffic-sensitive £54
Major works – up to 3 days	Road Category 0-2 or Traffic-sensitive £65	Road Category 3-4 and non-traffic-sensitive £45
Standard works – between 4 and 10 days	Road Category 0-2 or Traffic-sensitive £117	Road Category 3-4 and non-traffic-sensitive £37
Minor works – 3 days or less	Road Category 0-2 or Traffic-sensitive £65	Road Category 3-4 and non-traffic-sensitive £23
Immediate works – Emergency Works, which are defined in Section 52 of NRSWA	Road Category 0-2 or Traffic-sensitive £54	Road Category 3-4 and non-traffic-sensitive £22
Permit Variations – the need to alter the original plan	Road Category 0-2 or Traffic-sensitive £45	Road Category 3-4 and non-traffic-sensitive £35

APPENDIX 2 - KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DATA

KPI 1 - THE NUMBER OF PERMIT AND PERMIT VARIATION APPLICATIONS RECEIVED, THE NUMBER GRANTED, AND THE NUMBER REFUSED.

Table 3 below shows a breakdown of Permit applications received granted and refused. This excludes Provisional Permit Applications (PAAs).

Data on Applications and Variations that are superseded is being removed from this and future reports as applications and variations applied for and granted is the meaningful data.

Data is further broken down into Permit applications received, granted and refused related to Highway Authority works and Utilities works on Table 4 below.

TABLE 2(A) KPI 1 THE NUMBER OF PERMIT AND PERMIT VARIATION APPLICATIONS RECEIVED, THE NUMBER GRANTED AND THE NUMBER REFUSED AND DEEMED. YEAR 1

Total Applications Received	41,379	
Total Variations Received	17,399	
Applications Granted	37,412	90%
Variations Granted	15,905	91%
Applications Refused	1,143	3%
Variations Refused	617	4%
Applications Deemed	20	0%
Variations Deemed	0	0%

TABLE 2(B) KPI 1 THE NUMBER OF PERMIT AND PERMIT VARIATION APPLICATIONS RECEIVED, THE NUMBER GRANTED AND THE NUMBER REFUSED AND DEEMED. YEAR 2

Total Applications Received	38,332	
Total Variations Received	18,935	
Applications Granted	33,009	86%
Variations Granted	16,104	85%
Applications Refused	2,445	6%
Variations Refused	1,597	8%
Applications Deemed	60	0%
Variations Deemed	0	0%

TABLE 3(A) KPI 1 PERMIT APPLICATIONS BY PROMOTER. YEAR 1

Highway Authority Total Permit Applications	14,742	36%
Utility Total Permit Applications	26,637	64%
Highway Authority Total Applications Granted	13,938	95%
Utility Total Applications Granted	23,475	88%
Highway Authority Total Applications Refused	208	1%
Utility Total Applications Refused	935	4%
Highway Authority Total Permit Variations	1,403	8%
Utility Total Permit Variations	15,996	92
Highway Authority Total Variations Granted	1,383	99%
Utility Total Variations Granted	14,522	81%
Highway Authority Total Variations Refused	21	1.5%
Utility Total Variations Refused	596	4%

TABLE 3(B) KPI 1 PERMIT APPLICATIONS BY PROMOTER. YEAR 2

Highway Authority Total Permit Applications	12,768	33%
Utility Total Permit Applications	25,564	67%
Highway Authority Total Applications Granted	11,472	90%
Utility Total Applications Granted	21,537	84%
Highway Authority Total Applications Refused	336	3%
Utility Total Applications Refused	2,109	8%
Highway Authority Total Permit Variations	1,356	7%
Utility Total Permit Variations	17,579	93%
Highway Authority Total Variations Granted	1,306	96%
Utility Total Variations Granted	14,798	84%
Highway Authority Total Variations Refused	42	3%
Utility Total Variations Refused	1,556	9%

TABLE 4(A) KPI 1 THE NUMBER OF PERMIT AND PERMIT VARIATION APPLICATIONS RECEIVED, GRANTED, REFUSED AND DEEMED BY PROMOTER. YEAR 1

Promoter	Applications Received	Variations Received	Applications Granted	Variations Granted	Applications Refused	Variations Refused	Applications Deemed	Variations Deemed
Highway Authority	14,742	1,403	13,938	1,383	208	21	7	
Arqiva Ltd	29	19	22	19	1	1		
BT	5,663	3,828	5,135	3,630	269	182	4	
Broadband for the Rural North (B4RN)	13	10	9	10				
BSkyB Telecoms Ltd	1	2		1		1		
Cadent Gas Limited	27	13	21	15	2	2		
City Fibre	2	0	1					
Department for Transport	1	0	1					
Electricity North West	881	86	81	68	6	5		
Energy Assets Networks Ltd	6	7	6	6				
ES Pipelines	4	3	3	4				
Fulcrum Pipelines Limited	34	28	26	22	3	3	1	
GEO	40	53	26	30	5	6		
GTC	119	163	113	118	4	5		
Harlaxton Energy Networks	5	4	3	4				
Independent Next Generation Networks Ltd	1	3	1	3				
Interoute	2	3	2	2				
Last Mile Gas Limited	1	2						
Northern Gas Networks	2,316	2,324	1,964	1,932	108	107		
National Grid Electric PLC	9	8	8	10	0	0		
Network Rail	485	206	425	210	19	9		

North Yorkshire County Council Permit Scheme Yr 2 Evaluation Report – 2nd DRAFT

Northern Powergrid (Northeast) Ltd	2,209	1,563	1,920	1,380	63	44	2	
Northern Powergrid (Yorkshire) plc	780	628	691	537	26	19		
Northumbrian Water	423	269	333	243	6	5		
Opal Telecom	37	0	2	0	0	0		
Romec	25	7	22	7				
T-Mobile	24	7	20	9	0	0		
Telefonica (O2 (UK) Limited)	24	7	19	9				
United Utilities Water Limited	41	33	38	33				
Virgin Media	365	110	323	112	2	1		
Vodafone	18	14	14	13	2	1		
Yorkshire Water	13,052	6,596	12,245	6,095	419	207	6	
Utility Total	26,637	15,996	23,475	14,522	935	596	13	

TABLE 4(B) KPI 1 THE NUMBER OF PERMIT AND PERMIT VARIATION APPLICATIONS RECEIVED, GRANTED, REFUSED AND DEEMED BY PROMOTER. YEAR 2

Promoter	Applications Received	Variations Received	Applications Granted	Variations Granted	Applications Refused	Variations Refused	Applications Deemed	Variations Deemed
Highway Authority	12,768	1,356	11,472	1,306	336	42	31	
Arqiva Ltd	10	3	6	3	1	0		
BT	9,024	6,450	7,555	5,619	783	582	18	
Broadband for the Rural North (B4RN)	21	6	14	6	3	1		
Cadent Gas Limited	30	41	27	36	1	1		
Department for Transport	1	2	1	1				
Electricity North West	95	92	80	75	7	6		
Energy Assets Networks Ltd	25	35	19	21	4	4		
ES Pipelines	9	20	4	9	2	5		
Fulcrum Pipelines Limited	10	15	8	12				
GEO	96	105	70	84	5	6	1	
GTC	89	113	66	89	7	9		
Harlaxton Energy Networks	3	1	2	1	0	0		
Independent Next Generation Networks Ltd	16	6	14	5	1			
Last Mile Gas Limited	4	10	3	5	2	3		
Northern Gas Networks	1,815	2,008	1,469	1,581	240	259		
Network Rail	422	130	376	131	7	2		
Northern Powergrid (Northeast) Ltd	1,976	1,930	1,705	1,576	149	138	5	
Northern Powergrid (Yorkshire) plc	628	470	526	402	48	37	1	
Northumbrian Water	348	161	283	155	11	6		

North Yorkshire County Council Permit Scheme Yr 2 Evaluation Report – 2nd DRAFT

Opal Telecom	335	439	199	294	68	100		
Romec	21	17	16	12	1	1		
T-Mobile	4	4	4	3				
Telefonica (O2 (UK) Limited)	55	49	41	43	5	5		
United Utilities Water Limited	28	9	26	9	1	0		
Virgin Media	520	210	379	168	65	29		
Vodafone	12	13	11	6	4	3		
Yorkshire Water	9,967	5,240	8,633	4,451	696	359	4	
Utility Total	25,564	17,579	21,537	14,798	2,109	1,556	29	

TABLE 5(A) KPI 1 PERMIT AND VARIATION GRANTED, NUMBER REFUSED, DEEMED AND CANCELLED FOR CATEGORY 0-2 AND TRAFFIC SENSITIVE STREETS FOR UTILITY WORKS BY ACTIVITY TYPE. YEAR 1

Activity Type	Permit App Granted		Permit App Refused		Variation Granted		Variation Refused		Deemed Permit Applications		Deemed Permit Variations		Cancelled /Aborted	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Provisional Advance	450	8%												
Major	350	6%	20	10%	337	10%	27	13%					42	8%
Standard	780	14%	51	26%	816	24%	60	29%					156	30%
Minor	2,177	38%	112	58%	1,645	48%	93	44%	2	50%			303	58%
Immediate	2,001	35%	10	5%	607	18%	29	14%	2	50%			18	3%
Permit Variation														
Total	5,758		193		3,405		209		4				519	

TABLE 5(B) KPI 1 PERMIT AND VARIATION GRANTED, NUMBER REFUSED, DEEMED AND CANCELLED FOR CATEGORY 0-2 AND TRAFFIC SENSITIVE STREETS FOR UTILITY WORKS BY ACTIVITY TYPE. YEAR 2

Activity Type	Permit App Granted		Permit App Refused		Variation Granted		Variation Refused		Deemed Permit Applications		Deemed Permit Variations		Cancelled /Aborted	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Provisional Advance	350	7%												
Major	307	6%	30	8%	337	10%	37	9%					49	6%
Standard	581	11%	54	14%	838	25%	171	41%	1	17%			187	22%
Minor	2,459	46%	290	75%	1,689	50%	202	49%	5	83%			617	71%
Immediate	1,615	30%	13	3%	538	16%	5	1%	-	0%			13	2%
Permit Variation														
Total	5,312		387		3,402		415		6				866	

TABLE 6(A) KPI 1 PERMIT AND VARIATION GRANTED, NUMBER REFUSED, DEEMED AND CANCELLED FOR CATEGORY 3-4 NON-TRAFFIC SENSITIVE STREETS FOR UTILITY WORKS BY ACTIVITY TYPE. YEAR 1

Activity Type	Permit App Granted		Permit App Refused		Variation Granted		Variation Refused		Deemed Permit Applications		Deemed Permit Variations		Cancelled /Aborted	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Provisional Advance	1,598	8%												
Major	1,109	6%	66	10%	1,194	11%	77	12%					150	9%
Standard	2,470	13%	175	26%	2,585	24%	183	28%	2	22%			496	30%
Minor	6,532	35%	397	58%	5,209	48%	297	45%	3	33%			961	58%
Immediate	7,096	38%	43	6%	1,923	%	101	15%	4	44%			52	3%
Permit Variation														
Total	18,805		681		10,911		658		9				1,659	

TABLE 6(B) KPI 1 PERMIT AND VARIATION GRANTED, NUMBER REFUSED, DEEMED AND CANCELLED FOR CATEGORY 3-4 NON-TRAFFIC SENSITIVE STREETS FOR UTILITY WORKS BY ACTIVITY TYPE. YEAR 2

Activity Type	Permit App Granted		Permit App Refused		Variation Granted		Variation Refused		Deemed Permit Applications		Deemed Permit Variations		Cancelled /Aborted	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Provisional Advance	1,109	6%												
Major	1,060	6%	102	7%	1,071	9%	127	9%	3	13%			166	6%
Standard	2,189	12%	445	28%	2,655	23%	576	40%	2	9%			626	22%
Minor	8,233	46%	974	62%	5,990	52%	717	50%	16	70%			1,955	70%
Immediate	5,116	29%	45	3%	1,705	15%	20	1%	2	9%			47	2%
Permit Variation														
Total	17,707		1,566		11,421		1,440		23				2,794	

TABLE 7(A) KPI 1 THE NUMBER OF PERMIT AND PERMIT VARIATION GRANTED, NUMBER REFUSED, DEEMED AND CANCELLED FOR UTILITY WORKS BY ACTIVITY TYPE. YEAR 1

Activity Type	Permit App Granted		Permit App Refused		Variation Granted		Variation Refused		Deemed Permit Applications		Deemed Permit Variations		Cancelled /Aborted	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Provisional Advance	2,048	8%												
Major	1,459	6%	86	10%	1,531	11%	104	12%					192	9%
Standard	3,250	13%	226	26%	3,401	24%	243	28%	2	15%			652	30%
Minor	8,709	35%	509	58%	6,854	48%	390	45%	5	38%			1,264	58%
Immediate	9,097	37%	53	6%	2,530	18%	130	15%	6	46%			70	3%
Permit Variation														
Total	24,563		874		14,316		867		13				2,178	

TABLE 7(B) KPI 1 THE NUMBER OF PERMIT AND PERMIT VARIATION GRANTED, NUMBER REFUSED, DEEMED AND CANCELLED FOR UTILITY WORKS BY ACTIVITY TYPE. YEAR 2

Activity Type	Permit App Granted		Permit App Refused		Variation Granted		Variation Refused		Deemed Permit Applications		Deemed Permit Variations		Cancelled /Aborted	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Provisional Advance	1,459	6%												
Major	1,367	6%	132	7%	1,408	9%	164	9%	3	10%			215	6%
Standard	2,770	12%	499	26%	3,493	24%	747	40%	3	10%			813	22%
Minor	10,692	46%	1,264	65%	7,679	52%	919	50%	21	72%			2,572	70%
Immediate	6,731	29%	58	3%	2,243	15%	25	1%	2	7%			60	2%
Permit Variation														
Total	23,019		1,953		14,823		1,855		29				3,660	

TABLE 8(A) KPI 1 PERMIT AND VARIATION GRANTED, NUMBER REFUSED, DEEMED AND CANCELLED FOR CATEGORY 0-2 AND TRAFFIC SENSITIVE STREETS FOR HIGHWAY WORKS BY ACTIVITY TYPE. YEAR 1

Activity Type	Permit App Granted		Permit App Refused		Variation Granted		Variation Refused		Deemed Permit Applications		Deemed Permit Variations		Cancelled /Aborted	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Provisional Advance	300	10%												
Major	268	9%	26	46%	109	42%	6	46%					20	26%
Standard	25	1%	2	4%	17	7%							4	5%
Minor	742	25%	20	36%	133	51%	7	54%	1	100%			52	67%
Immediate	1,662	55%	8	14%	2	1%	-	0%	-	0%			2	3%
Permit Variation														
Total	2,997		56		261		13		1		-		78	

TABLE 8(B) KPI 1 PERMIT AND VARIATION GRANTED, NUMBER REFUSED, DEEMED AND CANCELLED FOR CATEGORY 0-2 AND TRAFFIC SENSITIVE STREETS FOR HIGHWAY WORKS BY ACTIVITY TYPE. YEAR 2

Activity Type	Permit App Granted		Permit App Refused		Variation Granted		Variation Refused		Deemed Permit Applications		Deemed Permit Variations		Cancelled /Aborted	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Provisional Advance	337	13%												
Major	248	10%	5	14%	68	26%	2	17%					58	27%
Standard	52	2%	4	11%	19	7%	2	17%	1	17%			15	7%
Minor	1,036	41%	20	56%	174	66%	8	67%	5	83%			140	65%
Immediate	859	34%	7	19%	1	0%	-	0%	-	0%			4	2%
Permit Variation														
Total	2,532		36		262		12		6				217	

TABLE 9(A) KPI 1 PERMIT AND VARIATION GRANTED, NUMBER REFUSED, DEEMED AND CANCELLED FOR CATEGORY 3-4 NON TRAFFIC SENSITIVE STREETS FOR HIGHWAY WORKS BY ACTIVITY TYPE. YEAR 1

Activity Type	Permit App Granted		Permit App Refused		Variation Granted		Variation Refused		Deemed Permit Applications		Deemed Permit Variations		Cancelled /Aborted	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Provisional Advance	1,201	12%												
Major	1,074	11%	105	47%	468	42%	18	50%	1	17%			105	28%
Standard	109	1%	5	2%	70	6%	4	2%	1	17%			23	6%
Minor	742	7%	82	37%	566	51%	14	39%	2	33%			246	65%
Immediate	7,090	69%	31	14%	7	1%			2	33%			5	1%
Permit Variation														
Total	10,216		223		1,111		36		6				379	

TABLE 9(B) KPI 1 PERMIT AND VARIATION GRANTED, NUMBER REFUSED, DEEMED AND CANCELLED FOR CATEGORY 3-4 NON-TRAFFIC SENSITIVE STREETS FOR HIGHWAY WORKS BY ACTIVITY TYPE. YEAR 2

Activity Type	Permit App Granted		Permit App Refused		Variation Granted		Variation Refused		Deemed Permit Applications		Deemed Permit Variations		Cancelled /Aborted	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Provisional Advance	1,350	13%												
Major	993	9%	2	1%	309	27%	6	13%	1	4%			248	27%
Standard	225	2%	18	7%	99	9%	7	16%	4	16%			72	8%
Minor	4,146	39%	205	76%	745	64%	32	71%	18	72%			597	64%
Immediate	3,914	37%	44	16%	4	0%			2	8%			17	2%
Permit Variation														
Total	10,628		269		1,157		45		25				934	

TABLE 10(A) KPI 1 THE NUMBER OF PERMIT AND PERMIT VARIATION GRANTED, NUMBER REFUSED, DEEMED AND CANCELLED FOR HIGHWAY WORKS BY ACTIVITY TYPE. YEAR 1

Activity Type	Permit App Granted		Permit App Refused		Variation Granted		Variation Refused		Deemed Permit Applications		Deemed Permit Variations		Cancelled /Aborted	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Provisional Advance	1,501	11%												
Major	1,342	10%	131	47%	577	42%	24	49%	1	14%			125	27%
Standard	134	1%	7	3%	87	6%	4	8%	1	14%			27	6%
Minor	1,484	11%	102	37%	699	51%	21	43%	3	43%			298	65%
Immediate	8,752	66%	39	14%	9	1%			2	29%			7	2%
Permit Variation														
Total	13,213		279		1,372		49		7				457	

TABLE 10(B) KPI 1 THE NUMBER OF PERMIT AND PERMIT VARIATION GRANTED, NUMBER REFUSED, DEEMED AND CANCELLED FOR HIGHWAY WORKS BY ACTIVITY TYPE. YEAR 2

Activity Type	Permit App Granted		Permit App Refused		Variation Granted		Variation Refused		Deemed Permit Applications		Deemed Permit Variations		Cancelled /Aborted	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Provisional Advance	1,687	13%												
Major	1,241	9%	7	2%	377	27%	8	14%	1	3%			306	27%
Standard	277	2%	22	7%	118	8%	9	16%	5	16%			87	8%
Minor	5,182	39%	225	74%	919	65%	40	70%	23	74%			737	64%
Immediate	4,773	36%	51	17%	5	0%			2	6%			21	2%
Permit Variation														
Total	13,160		305		1,419		57		31		-		1,151	

TABLE 11(A) KPI 1 PERMIT AND VARIATION GRANTED, NUMBER REFUSED, DEEMED AND CANCELLED FOR CATEGORY 0-2 AND TRAFFIC SENSITIVE STREETS FOR ALL WORKS BY ACTIVITY TYPE. YEAR 1

Activity Type	Permit App Granted		Permit App Refused		Variation Granted		Variation Refused		Deemed Permit Applications		Deemed Permit Variations		Cancelled /Aborted	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Provisional Advance	750	9%												
Major	618	7%	46	18%	446	12%	33	15%					62	10%
Standard	805	9%	53	21%	833	23%	60	27%					160	27%
Minor	2,919	33%	132	53%	1,778	48%	100	45%	3	60%			355	59%
Immediate	3,663	42%	18	7%	609	17%	29	13%	2	40%			20	3%
Permit Variation														
Total	8,755		249		3,666		222		5				597	

TABLE 11(B) KPI 1 PERMIT AND VARIATION GRANTED, NUMBER REFUSED, DEEMED AND CANCELLED FOR CATEGORY 0-2 AND TRAFFIC SENSITIVE STREETS FOR ALL WORKS BY ACTIVITY TYPE. YEAR 2

Activity Type	Permit App Granted		Permit App Refused		Variation Granted		Variation Refused		Deemed Permit Applications		Deemed Permit Variations		Cancelled /Aborted	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Provisional Advance	687	9%												
Major	555	7%	35	8%	405	11%	39	9%					107	10%
Standard	633	8%	58	14%	857	23%	173	41%	2	17%			202	19%
Minor	3,495	45%	310	73%	1,863	51%	210	49%	10	83%			757	70%
Immediate	2,474	32%	20	5%	539	15%	5	1%					17	2%
Permit Variation														
Total	7,844		423		3,664		427		12				1,083	

TABLE 12(A) KPI 1 PERMIT AND VARIATION GRANTED, NUMBER REFUSED, DEEMED AND CANCELLED FOR CATEGORY 3-4 NON-TRAFFIC SENSITIVE STREETS FOR ALL WORKS BY ACTIVITY TYPE. YEAR 1

Activity Type	Permit App Granted		Permit App Refused		Variation Granted		Variation Refused		Deemed Permit Applications		Deemed Permit Variations		Cancelled /Aborted	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Provisional Advance	2,799	10%												
Major	2,183	8%	171	19%	1,662	14%	95	14%	1	7%			255	13%
Standard	2,579	9%	180	20%	2,655	22%	187	27%	3	20%			519	25%
Minor	7,274	25%	479	53%	5,775	48%	311	45%	5	33%			1,207	59%
Immediate	14,186	49%	74	8%	1,930	16%	101	15%	6	40%			57	3%
Permit Variation														
Total	29,021		904		12,022		694		15		-		2,038	

TABLE 12(B) KPI 1 PERMIT AND VARIATION GRANTED, NUMBER REFUSED, DEEMED AND CANCELLED FOR CATEGORY 3-4 NON-TRAFFIC SENSITIVE STREETS FOR ALL WORKS BY ACTIVITY TYPE. YEAR 2

Activity Type	Permit App Granted		Permit App Refused		Variation Granted		Variation Refused		Deemed Permit Applications		Deemed Permit Variations		Cancelled /Aborted	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Provisional Advance	2,459	9%												
Major	2,053	7%	104	6%	1,380	11%	133	9%	4	8%			414	11%
Standard	2,414	9%	463	25%	2,754	22%	583	39%	6	13%			698	19%
Minor	12,379	44%	1,179	64%	6,735	54%	749	50%	34	71%			2,552	68%
Immediate	9,030	32%	89	5%	1,709	14%	20	1%	4	8%			64	2%
Permit Variation														
Total	28,335		1,835		12,578		1,485		48				3,728	

TABLE 13(A) KPI 1 THE NUMBER OF PERMIT AND PERMIT VARIATION GRANTED, NUMBER REFUSED, DEEMED SUPERSEDED AND CANCELLED FOR ALL WORKS BY ACTIVITY TYPE. YEAR 1

Activity Type	Permit App Granted		Permit App Refused		Variation Granted		Variation Refused		Deemed Permit Applications		Deemed Permit Variations		Cancelled /Aborted	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Provisional Advance	3,549	9%												
Major	2,801	7%	217	19%	2,108	13%	128	14%	1	5%			317	12%
Standard	3,384	9%	233	20%	3,488	22%	247	27%	3	15%			679	26%
Minor	10,193	27%	611	53%	7,553	48%	411	45%	8	40%			1,562	59%
Immediate	17,849	47%	92	8%	2,539	16%	130	14%	8	40%			77	3%
Permit Variation														
Total	37,776		1,153		15,688		916		20				2,635	

TABLE 13(B) KPI 1 THE NUMBER OF PERMIT AND PERMIT VARIATION GRANTED, NUMBER REFUSED, DEEMED SUPERSEDED AND CANCELLED FOR ALL WORKS BY ACTIVITY TYPE. YEAR 2

Activity Type	Permit App Granted		Permit App Refused		Variation Granted		Variation Refused		Deemed Permit Applications		Deemed Permit Variations		Cancelled /Aborted	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Provisional Advance	3,146	9%												
Major	2,608	7%	139	6%	1,785	11%	172	9%	4	7%			521	11%
Standard	3,047	8%	521	23%	3,611	22%	756	40%	8	13%			900	19%
Minor	15,874	44%	1,489	66%	8,598	53%	959	50%	44	73%			3,309	69%
Immediate	11,504	32%	109	5%	2,248	14%	25	1%	4	7%			81	2%
Permit Variation														
Total	36,179		2,258		16,242		1,912		60				4,811	

KPI 2 - THE NUMBER OF CONDITIONS APPLIED BY CONDITION TYPE.

Conditions are attached to applications by the Works Promoter or when requested by the Permit Authority and help deliver the Permit Scheme objectives and societal benefits.

TABLE 14(A) KPI 2 THE NUMBER OF CONDITIONS APPLIED BY CONDITION TYPE. YEAR 1

Date Constraints			
Time Constraints	19,108	596	19,704
Out of Hours Work			
Material and Plant Storage	3,366		3,366
Road Occupation Dimensions	4,959	2	4,961
Traffic Space Dimensions	5,823	33	5,856
Road Closure	960	193	1,153
Light Signals and Shuttle Working	6,074	86	6,160
Traffic Management Changes	1,260	17	1,277
Work Methodology	17,269	17	17,286
Consultation and Publicity	1,450	66	1,516
Environmental	2		2
Local	19	9	28
Total	60,290	1,019	61,309

TABLE 14(A) KPI 2 THE NUMBER OF CONDITIONS APPLIED BY CONDITION TYPE. YEAR 2

Date Constraints			
Time Constraints	14,545	228	14,773
Out of Hours Work		3	3
Material and Plant Storage	1,604		1,604
Road Occupation Dimensions	7,726	3	7,729
Traffic Space Dimensions	7,315	8	7,323
Road Closure	1,371	11	1,382
Light Signals and Shuttle Working	8,609	48	8,657
Traffic Management Changes	2,745		2,745
Work Methodology	12,891	9	12,900

North Yorkshire County Council Permit Scheme Yr 2 Evaluation Report – 2nd DRAFT

Consultation and Publicity	1,124	5	1,129
Environmental	6		6
Local	44	12	56
Total	57,980	327	58,307

KPI 3 - THE NUMBER OF APPROVED EXTENSIONS

TABLE 15(A) KPI 3 THE NUMBER OF APPROVED EXTENSIONS. YEAR 1

Monthly breakdowns are not available for the IT system at this time.

	Highway Authority	Utilities	Total
Total	78	2,388	2,466

TABLE 15(A) KPI 3 THE NUMBER OF APPROVED EXTENSIONS. YEAR 2

Monthly breakdowns are not available for the IT system at this time.

	Highway Authority	Utilities	Total
Total	72	2,942	3,012

KPI 7 - NUMBER OF INSPECTIONS CARRIED OUT TO MONITOR CONDITIONS

This KPI is broken down by promoter and shown as the number of sample permit condition checks carried out as a percentage of those issued.

TABLE 16(A) KPI 7 NUMBER OF INSPECTIONS CARRIED OUT BY PROMOTER TO MONITOR CONDITIONS. YEAR 1

Promoter	Passed	Non-Compliant	Total inspections
Highway Authority	300	980	1,280
Arqiva Ltd	9	5	14
BT	1,954	2,048	4,002
City Fibre		1	1
Energy Assets Networks Ltd	2	2	4
ES Pipelines	9	4	13
Fulcrum Pipelines Limited			
GEO	8		8
GTC	41	44	85
Harlaxton Energy Networks	3		3
Northern Gas Networks	87	58	145
Network Rail	9	23	32
Northumbrian Water	101	169	270

North Yorkshire County Council Permit Scheme Yr 2 Evaluation Report – 2nd DRAFT

Romec	5	16	21
T-Mobile		3	3
Telefonica (O2 (UK) Limited)	5	3	8
United Utilities Water Limited	10	24	34
Virgin Media	28	84	112
Vodafone	6	8	14
Yorkshire Water	4,918	1,739	6,657
Utility Total	7,195	4,231	11,426

TABLE 16(B) KPI 7 NUMBER OF INSPECTIONS CARRIED OUT BY PROMOTER TO MONITOR CONDITIONS. YEAR 2

Promoter	Passed	Non-Compliant	Total inspections
Highway Authority	472	1,227	1,699
BT	2,160	1,985	4,145
Cadent Gas Limited	19	17	36
Energy Assets Networks Ltd	14	11	25
Fulcrum Pipelines Limited			
GEO	12	24	36
Harlaxton Energy Networks	3	-	3
Northern Gas Networks	43	24	67
Network Rail	15	8	23
Northumbrian Water	178	122	300
Opal Telecom	151	35	186
Romec	4	2	6
T-Mobile	2	2	4
Telefonica (O2 (UK) Limited)	17	3	20
Virgin Media	87	36	123
Vodafone	6		6
Yorkshire Water	4,637	2,175	6,812
Utility Total	7,348	4,444	11,792

HAUC TPI MEASURES

TABLE 17(A) TPI 1 WORKS PHASES STARTED (BASE DATA) BY PROMOTER. YEAR 1

Activity Type	Major	Standard	Minor	Urgent	Emergency	Total
All Promoters	2,398	2,284	8,401	15,372	1,006	29,461
Highway Authority	1,195	95	1,963	7,687	17	10,957
Utilities	1,203	2,189	6,438	7,685	989	18,504

TABLE 17(B) TPI 1 WORKS PHASES STARTED (BASE DATA) BY PROMOTER. YEAR 2

Activity Type	Major	Standard	Minor	Urgent	Emergency	Total
All Promoters	1,870	2,358	10,902	10,968	948	27,046
Highway Authority	575	115	2,539	4,764	19	8,012
Utilities	1,295	2,243	8,363	6,204	929	19,034

TABLE 18 TPI 1 WORKS PHASES STARTED (BASE DATA) FOR HIGHWAY AUTHORITY WORKS.

This data is not available from the IT system at this time.

TABLE 19 TPI 1 WORKS PHASES STARTED (BASE DATA) FOR UTILITY WORKS.

This data is not available from the IT system at this time.

TABLE 20(A) TPI 2 WORKS PHASES COMPLETED (BASE DATA) BY PROMOTER. YEAR 1

Activity Type	Major	Standard	Minor	Urgent	Emergency	Total
All Promoters	2,398	2,284	8,345	15,299	999	29,325
Highway Authority	1,199	95	1,917	7,585	15	10,811
Utilities	1,199	2,189	6,428	7,788	984	18,588

TABLE 20(B) TPI 2 WORKS PHASES COMPLETED (BASE DATA) BY PROMOTER. YEAR 2

Activity Type	Major	Standard	Minor	Urgent	Emergency	Total
All Promoters	1,929	2,474	10,924	10,940	951	27,218
Highway Authority	635	234	2,556	4,764	18	8,207
Utilities	1,294	2,240	8,368	6,176	933	19,011

TABLE 21 TPI 2 WORKS PHASES COMPLETED (BASE DATA) FOR HIGHWAY AUTHORITY WORKS BY REINSTATEMENT CATEGORY.

This data is not available from the IT system at this time.

TABLE 22 TPI 2 WORKS PHASES COMPLETED (BASE DATA) FOR UTILITY WORKS BY REINSTATEMENT CATEGORY

This data is not available from the IT system at this time.

TABLE 23(A) TPI 3 DAYS OF OCCUPANCY PHASES COMPLETED BY PROMOTER. YEAR 1

	Major	Standard	Minor	Urgent	Emergency	Total
All Promoters	59,451	47,812	74,867	85,395	11,367	278,892
Highway Authority	39,909	16,964	32,848	27,606	1,705	119,032
Utilities	19,542	30,848	42,019	57,789	9,662	159,860

TABLE 23(B) TPI 3 DAYS OF OCCUPANCY PHASES COMPLETED BY PROMOTER. YEAR 2

	Major	Standard	Minor	Urgent	Emergency	Total
All Promoters	45,590	58,915	83,159	64,827	11,937	264,428
Highway Authority	25,288	24,953	34,378	14,718	1,647	100,984
Utilities	20,302	33,962	48,781	50,109	10,290	163,444

TABLE 24 TPI 3 DAYS OF OCCUPANCY PHASES COMPLETED FOR HIGHWAY AUTHORITY WORKS BY REINSTATEMENT CATEGORY AND TRAFFIC SENSITIVITY

This data is not available from the IT system at this time.

TABLE 25 TPI 3 DAYS OF OCCUPANCY PHASES COMPLETED FOR UTILITY WORKS BY REINSTATEMENT CATEGORY AND TRAFFIC SENSITIVITY

This data is not available from the IT system at this time.

TABLE 26(A) TPI 4 AVERAGE DURATION OF WORKS PHASES COMPLETED. YEAR 1

Works Type	Highway Authority	Utility
Major	61	12
Standard	36	7
Minor	9	2
Immediate-Urgent	6	3
Immediate-Emergency	9	5

TABLE 26(B) TPI 4 AVERAGE DURATION OF WORKS PHASES COMPLETED. YEAR 2

Works Type	Highway Authority	Utility
Major	13	22
Standard	Anomalous data	6
Minor	2	2
Immediate-Urgent	2	3
Immediate-Emergency	10	3

TABLE 27(A) TPI 5 PHASES COMPLETED ON TIME. YEAR 1

Works Type	Major	Standard	Minor	Urgent	Emergency	Total
All Promoters	2,254	2,189	8,226	15,102	978	28,749
Highway Authority	1,062	82	1,820	7,431	10	10,405
Utilities	1,192	2,107	6,406	7,671	968	18,344

TABLE 27(B) TPI 5 PHASES COMPLETED ON TIME. YEAR 2

Works Type	Major	Standard	Minor	Urgent	Emergency	Total
All Promoters	1,785	2,291	10,816	10,833	934	26,659
Highway Authority	530	115	2,489	4,682	18	7,834
Utilities	1,255	2,176	8,327	6,151	916	18,825

TABLE 28(A) TPI 6 NUMBER OF DEEMED PERMIT APPLICATIONS. YEAR 1

Highway Authority	7
Utility	13

TABLE 28(B) TPI 6 NUMBER OF DEEMED PERMIT APPLICATIONS. YEAR 2

Highway Authority	31
Utility	29

TABLE 29 TPI 7 NUMBER OF PHASE ONE PERMANENT REGISTRATIONS. YEAR 1

Works Type	Major	Standard	Minor	Urgent	Emergency	Total
All Promoters	663	1,710	2,956	13,169	634	19,132
Highway Authority	-	-	-	-	-	-
Utilities	663	1,710	2,956	13,169	634	19,132

TABLE 29 TPI 7 NUMBER OF PHASE ONE PERMANENT REGISTRATIONS. YEAR 2

Works Type	Major	Standard	Minor	Urgent	Emergency	Total
All Promoters	703	1,631	3,878	4,771	656	11,639
Highway Authority	-	1	1	-	-	2
Utilities	703	1,630	3,877	4,771	656	11,637

TABLE 30 TPI7 NUMBER OF PHASE ONE PERMANENT REGISTRATIONS FOR HIGHWAY AUTHORITY WORKS BY REINSTATEMENT CATEGORY AND TRAFFIC SENSITIVITY STREET.

This data is not available from the IT system at this time.

TABLE 31 TPI7 NUMBER OF PHASE ONE PERMANENT REGISTRATIONS FOR UTILITY WORKS BY REINSTATEMENT CATEGORY AND TRAFFIC SENSITIVITY STREET.

This data is not available from the IT system at this time.

TABLE 32 NUMBER OF PAA APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED.

Year 1	4,928
Year 2	4,671

TABLE 33 NUMBER OF PAA APPLICATIONS GRANTED

Year 1	3,128
Year 2	3,146

TABLE 34 NUMBER OF PAA APPLICATIONS DEEMED

This data is not available from the IT system at this time.

TABLE 35 NUMBER OF “INITIAL” PERMIT APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED FOR A WORKS PHASE

Year 1	42,867
Year 2	36,361

TABLE 36 NUMBER OF PERMIT APPLICATIONS GRANTED ON FIRST APPLICATION SUBMISSION

Year 1	33,045
Year 2	27,467

TABLE 37 NUMBER OF “MODIFIED” APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED PRIOR TO PERMIT BEING GRANTED OR DEEMED

Year 1	9,818
Year 2	9,275

TABLE 38 NUMBER OF PERMIT APPLICATIONS DEEMED

Year 1	20
Year 2	60

TABLE 39 NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS CANCELLED PRIOR TO GRANT / DEEMED

Year 1	3,216
Year 2	4,801

TABLE 40 NUMBER OF GRANTED / DEEMED PERMITS FOR WHICH AND ACTUAL START NEVER OCCURRED

Year 1	4,370
Year 2	7,330

TABLE 41 NUMBER OF AUTHORITY IMPOSED VARIATIONS / REVOKES

Year 1	2,805
Year 2	1,348

TABLE 42 NUMBER OF DURATION VARIATIONS AFTER WORKS STARTED

Year 1	2,902
Year 2	3,102

TABLE 43 NUMBER OF DURATION VARIATIONS REFUSED

Year 1	52
Year 2	90

TABLE 44 NUMBER OF PERMIT APPLICATIONS WITH “COLLABORATION INDICATOR” SET

Year 1	122
Year 2	228

AUTHORITY MEASURES

TABLE 45(A) AM 1 AVERAGE DURATION OF WORKS IN DAYS BY PERMIT TYPE. YEAR 1

Works Type	Highway Authority	Utility
Major Works	61	2
Standard Works	36	1
Minor Works	9	2
Immediate Urgent Works	6	3
Immediate Emergency Works	9	5

TABLE 45(B) AM 1 AVERAGE DURATION OF WORKS IN DAYS BY PERMIT TYPE. YEAR 2

Works Type	Highway Authority	Utility
Major Works	13	22
Standard Works		1
Minor Works	2	
Immediate Urgent Works	2	
Immediate Emergency Works	10	3

TABLE 46(A) AM 2 CATEGORY A, B AND C INSPECTIONS AND FAILURE RATES BY PROMOTER. YEAR 1

Promoter	Total CAT A Inspections	Total CAT A Failures	Total CAT A Failure rate	Total CAT B Inspections	Total CAT B Failures	Total CAT B Failure rate	Total CAT C Inspections	Total CAT C Failures	Total CAT C Failure rate	Total Inspections	Total Failures	Total Failure rate
Highway Authority	70	13	19%	33	27	82%				103	40	39%
Arqiva Ltd	3	-	0%	4	3	75%				7	3	43%
BT	516	109	21%	915	339	37%	734	207	28%	2,165	655	30%
Energy Assets Networks Ltd	2	1	50%							2	1	50%
Fulcrum Pipelines Limited	4	1	25%				1	-	0%	5	1	20%
GEO	5	-	0%							5	-	0%
Harlaxton Energy Networks	1	-	0%							1	-	0%
Northern Gas Networks	118	41	35%	16	8	50%				134	49	37%
Network Rail	8	3	38%	1	1	100%				9	4	44%
Northumbrian Water	26	13	50%	28	19	68%	2	2	100%	56	34	61%
Romec				7	3	43%	1	1	100%	8	4	50%
United Utilities Water Limited	2	1	50%	10	4	40%	5	4	80%	17	9	53%
Virgin Media	11	1	9%	70	31	44%	52	16	31%	133	48	36%
Vodafone							3	3	100%	3	3	100%
Yorkshire Water	2,210	599	27%	1,829	854	47%	1,182	372	31%	5,221	1,825	35%
Utility Total	2,906	769	26%	2,880	1,262	44%	1,980	605	31%	7,766	2,636	34%

TABLE 46(B) AM 2 CATEGORY A, B AND C INSPECTIONS (PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL UNDERTAKEN AND FAILURES) YEAR 2 BY PROMOTER BY ACTIVITY TYPE BY PROMOTER. YEAR 2

Promoter	Total CAT A Inspections	Total CAT A Failures	Total CAT A Failure rate	Total CAT B Inspections	Total CAT B Failures	Total CAT B Failure rate	Total CAT C Inspections	Total CAT C Failures	Total CAT C Failure rate	Total Inspections	Total Failures	Total Failure rate
Highway Authority	343	68	20%	83	44	53%	21	15	71%	447	127	28%
Arqiva Ltd	1		0%	1		0%				2	-	0%
BT	587	104	18%	874	310	35%	545	112	21%	2,006	526	26%
Energy Assets Networks Ltd	14	2	14%	6	6	100%				20	8	40%
Fulcrum Pipelines Limited	6	2	33%	1	-	0%				7	2	29%
GEO	4	1	25%	18	12	67%				22	13	59%
Harlaxton Energy Networks	2		0%							2		0%
Northern Gas Networks	45	10	22%	12	8	67%				57	18	32%
Network Rail	5		0%	5	4	80%				10	4	40%
Northumbrian Water	73	27	37%	86	37	43%	31	7	23%	190	71	37%
Romec	2		0%	2		0%				4		0%
United Utilities Water Limited							3		0%	3		0%
Virgin Media	15	1	7%	44	11	25%	25	5	20%	84	17	20%
Vodafone	2		0%	1		0%	1		0%	4		0%
Yorkshire Water	1,429	332	23%	1,186	361	30%	773	194	25%	3,388	887	26%
Utility Total	2,185	479	22%	2,236	749	33%	1,378	318	23%	5,799	1,546	27%

TABLE 47 AM 3 - DAYS OF DISRUPTION SAVED/ NUMBER OF COLLABORATIVE WORKS

The type of collaboration (Permit / Trench Sharing) and days saved This data is not available from the IT system at this time.

	Number of Collaborative Works
Year 1 Total Collaborative Works	122
Year 2 Total Collaborative Works	228

AM 4 - RESPONSE CODE

Previous response codes have been replaced with the table below.

The below table outlines 5 categories for reporting on Permit Refusals and Modification Requests, further refusals codes and sample text are provided for specific refusals reasons within those broad categories.

Authorities should wherever possible utilise the detailed codes in preference to the generic codes (e.g., RC11 or RC12 should be used over RC10) as this will drive more meaningful outputs and identify areas of improvement in permit applications, therefore only the codes below should be used to bring National consistency.

Both Authorities and Undertakers can report on this data and use the results to drive improvements in the quality of Permit Applications.

It is very important to note that whatever code is used, the reason for the refusal must be entirely clear.

If using the general codes (RC10, RC20), the specific reason must be clearly stated.

Please also refer to Regulation 9 (10) of the amended Regulations.

Equally, all works promoters should be fully aware it is an offence to undertake works without a valid permit.

Each code is worded ambiguously, so the Highway Authority will need to specify if it requires a refusal or modification.

PERMIT RESPONSE CODES, TYPE, DESCRIPTION AND SUGGESTED TEXT

Permit Response Code RC10 Missing Information	This would include instances where required conditions have not been provided/are not necessary or conflict. The works description or location information provided is insufficient. Use this code for missing information issues not covered by the below.
Permit Response Code RC11 Condition Not Provided/Not Necessary	You have omitted essential conditions for these works. If you still plan to proceed with the activity, you must supply the appropriate conditions within the conditions text box. [NAME] [Tel]
Permit Response Code RC12 TM Not Received	Please provide the required [illustration/traffic management drawing/works activity footprint] for this activity. Please supply the required plan and submit a new application once you have received approval. [NAME] [Tel]
Permit Response Code RC20 Incorrect Details on Permit	This would include where the dates, USRN or primary recipient of the Permit are incorrect. Use this code for incorrect Permit detail issues not covered by the below.
Permit Response Code RC21 Incorrect Primary Recipient	You have incorrectly selected XXX as the primary recipient of the permit. If you still plan to proceed with this activity you must submit a new permit application ensuring that you have issued it to the correct permitting authority. [NAME] [Tel]

North Yorkshire County Council Permit Scheme Yr 2 Evaluation Report – 2nd DRAFT

Permit Response Code RC22 Location Issues	Your location description and map coordinates conflict, preventing effective coordination of these works. If you still plan to proceed with the activity you must amend this information. [NAME] [Tel]
Permit Response Code RC23 Conflicting Information	You have conflicting information contained within your permit application. You state [Example 1] which conflicts with [Example 2] If you still plan to proceed with the activity you must supply consistent information. [NAME] [Tel]
Permit Response Code RC30 Co-ordination Issues	This would include where the works will cause any sort of conflict (e.g with an event.) Use this code for co-ordination issues not covered by the below.
Permit Response Code RC31 Clash of Works	Your works will conflict with other activities for your proposed dates at this location, and collaboration is not possible. Please submit a new permit application with alternative dates. The conflicting works are estimated to be completed on [XX/XX/XXXX]. [NAME] [Tel]
Permit Response Code RC32 Timing of Works	You have not specified the precise [Times/Days] that your work site(s) will be occupying the public highway. If you still plan to proceed with this activity you must supply the necessary timing information. [NAME] [Tel]
Permit Response Code RC33 Collaboration / Co-ordination	Your works will conflict with other activities for your proposed dates at this location. Please confirm you can co-ordinate your works with the party who are (Name of Conflicting Promoter). If you still plan to proceed with this activity you must submit a new permit application with alternative dates or an agreement of collaboration. The conflicting works are estimated to be completed on [XX/XX/XXXX] by (XXXXX promoter). [NAME] [Tel]
Permit Response Code RC40 Lack of Approval	This would include where TM approval has not been given, an early start has not been sought, the duration applied for is not viewed as acceptable or where the Permit applied for does not reflect prior agreements made. Use this code for general lack of approval or the codes below for a specific issue.
Permit Response Code RC41 Incorrect TM	You have not gained the relevant [TM plan/WAF/site meeting] (delete as appropriate) approval for these works. [NAME] [Tel]
Permit Response Code RC42 Early Start Agreement	No Early Start Agreement has [not been obtained/not been justified] for this activity. [NAME] [Tel]
Permit Response Code RC43 S.58 Restriction	This street is protected by a section 58 restriction. Please provided evidence that you have the relevant agreement to work within this restriction. [NAME] [Tel]
Permit Response Code RC44 Duration	The duration is considered to be excessive / insufficient [delete as required] because [XX]. Please specify a duration not longer than [XX] working days. [NAME] [Tel]
Permit Response Code RC50 Other	Any other reason not covered – As above you must clearly state the refusal reason – this category should be kept to a minimum otherwise the quality of the data can be diluted and made less useful in driving performance improvement.

TABLE 48(A) AM 4 PERMIT RESPONSE CODES ISSUED BY PROMOTER. YEAR 1

Code	RC10	RC11	RC12	RC20	RC21	RC22	RC23	RC30	RC31	RC32	RC33	RC40	RC41	RC42	RC43	RC44	RC50
Highway Authority	165	52	14	19		243	101	19	74	115	28	97	236	1		37	73
Arqiva Ltd	4	3				4	4			6			3				1
BT	511	160	195	14	-	226	261	45	297	330	61	51	497	3	5	247	108
Broadband for the Rural North (B4RN)	4	2	1	1				1				2	3				
BSkyB Telecommunication Services Ltd	1						1										
Cadent Gas Limited	7	5				1			3				3			4	2
Electricity North West	17	12	1				1	1	5	3			9			6	1
Energy Assets Networks Ltd				1		1	1			1			3				1
ES Pipelines		1									1						-
Fulcrum Pipelines Limited	7	2	1			1	1	-	-	3	2	1	7	1		4	1
GEO		1					7	-	9	1		5	4			-	3
GTC	11	20	1			14	9	2	20	14	4	1	32			15	6
Independent Next Generation Networks Ltd		1															
Interoute		1															2
Last Mile Electricity Limited												1				2	
National Grid Electric PLC	2	1		1		2	1						1				
Northern Gas Networks	259	122	37	3		121	143	19	65	76	20	29	178	4	4	202	52
Network Rail	65	4	31	2		1	6	3	7	16		94	12	-	-	2	4
Northern Powergrid (Northeast) Ltd	162	53	37	4		72	110	14	70	92	13	18	171	1	-	148	33
Northern Powergrid (Yorkshire) plc	36	17	3	6		28	23	5	25	18	6	25	35	-	9	53	9
Northumbrian Water	51	27	1	-		4	6	1	10	12	2	9	13	-	-	28	7
NYNET																	
Opal Telecom																	

North Yorkshire County Council Permit Scheme Yr 2 Evaluation Report – 2nd DRAFT

Romec	3	1				1	1										1
T-Mobile	1									2							1
Telefonica (O2 (UK) Limited)	1	1				2			1	-	-		2				
United Utilities Water Limited	16	4	2			1	1			5			3			1	1
Virgin Media	24	8	-	1		4	21	6	5	3	1		13			1	8
Vodafone	3	4	2				1		2	2			4			1	-
Yorkshire Water	868	141	118	24	4	226	525	103	370	582	65	245	717	2	19	710	199
Utility Total	2,053	591	430	57	4	709	1,123	200	889	1,166	175	481	1,710	11	37	1,424	440

TABLE 48(B) AM 4 PERMIT RESPONSE CODES ISSUED BY PROMOTER. YEAR 2

Code	RC10	RC11	RC12	RC20	RC21	RC22	RC23	RC30	RC31	RC32	RC33	RC40	RC41	RC42	RC43	RC44	RC50
Highway Authority	194	96	2	14	-	179	137	63	179	149	19	113	322	-	2	44	91
Arqiva Ltd		1						1					1				
BT	578	622	133	25	1	417	374	191	823	459	85	181	782	3	42	245	242
Broadband for the Rural North (B4RN)	1	2				1						1	2				1
Cadent Gas Limited	12	5					3		1		2	-	1			4	2
City Fibre																	
Electricity North West	11	15	2				1		3	7	-	6	7			7	4
Energy Assets Networks Ltd	5			1	-	3	3		1	1	1		8			1	-
ES Pipelines		1					4		3			1	5			2	-
ESP Electricity Ltd																	
Fulcrum Pipelines Limited	4	8	2			2	5		7			2	7			31	-
GEO	4	12		1		-	2	3	2	11			4			4	3
GTC	12	7	2	1		4	7	2	16	6	7	1	17			8	2
Harlaxton Energy Networks													1				
Independent Next Generation Networks Ltd	2	1								2			1			1	

North Yorkshire County Council Permit Scheme Yr 2 Evaluation Report – 2nd DRAFT

Last Mile Electricity Limited		5	2			1	2			5		1	3			8	
Last Mile Gas Limited		1	2				1	1		1						1	1
Murphy Power Distribution																	
National Grid Electric PLC																	
Northern Gas Networks	217	109	11	7		103	127	27	65	33	10	35	165	3	13	141	48
Network Rail	11	10	21			2	2	1	4	9	2	57	2				5
Northern Powergrid (Northeast) Ltd	156	89	45			73	97	38	93	108	30	61	199		22	112	49
Northern Powergrid (Yorkshire) plc	27	15	6	2		14	26	5	20	10	5	3	41		3	34	8
Northumbrian Water	27	13	5	-		7	8		5	6	4	3	14			11	5
NYNET																	
Opal Telecom	24	51		1		38	64		7			4	57			68	13
Quickline Communications Ltd																	
Romec	3					5	8	-	-	-	-		1				-
T-Mobile	1					1		-	2	-	2		-				-
Telefonica (O2 (UK) Limited)	5	10	4			5	7	1	8	3	1		10				4
United Utilities Water Limited	2							1									-
Virgin Media	23	25	1		-	31	45	4	28	10	2	1	31		3	2	24
Vodafone	2	4	-	1		2	2	-	4	2			2		2	1	
Yorkshire Water	459	278	128	17		393	434	83	373	299	67	190	562		45	285	162
Utility Total	1,586	1,284	364	56	1	1,102	1,222	358	1,465	972	218	547	1,923	6	130	966	573

AM 5 FPNS (PERMIT BREACHES)

Table 50 below shows the number of fixed penalty notices. Under section 74 (7B) failure to give a notice under regulation 74 (charge for occupation of the highway where works unreasonably delayed); under section 19 (1) working without a Permit and under 20 (1) Permit breaches. The Permit Authority will continue to work with Promoters to reduce the number of FPN's.

PERMIT BREACH CODE DESCRIPTIONS

Code 70(6)	Failure to comply with requirements to give notice of completion of reinstatement
Code 74(7B)	Failure to give a notice under regulation 74 (charge for occupation of the highway where works unreasonably delayed)
Code 19(1)	Works without a permit
Code 20(1)	Permit breaches

TABLE 49(A) AM 5 FPNS (PERMIT BREACHES) – BROKEN DOWN BY PROMOTER. YEAR 1

	70(6)	74(7B)	19(1)	20(1)	Total
Highway Authority	15	75	1	2	93
Arqiva Ltd	3	6		1	10
BT	89	170	32	303	594
Energy Assets Networks Ltd				2	2
Fulcrum Pipelines Limited	1	4	1	8	14
GEO		4	4	1	9
Harlaxton Energy Networks		1			1
Northern Gas Networks			6		6
Network Rail	1	11	6	20	38
Northumbrian Water	20	16	2	35	73
United Utilities Water Limited				1	1
Virgin Media	5	9	1	4	19
Vodafone			1		1
Yorkshire Water	266	381	68	1,123	1,838
Utility Total	401	677	122	1,500	2,700

TABLE 49 (B) AM 5 FPNS (PERMIT BREACHES) – BROKEN DOWN BY PROMOTER. YEAR 2

	70(6)	74(7B)	19(1)	20(1)	Total
Highway Authority	8	18	4		30
BT	141	411	42	415	1,009
Energy Assets Networks Ltd	1	2	1	14	18
Fulcrum Pipelines Limited		1		5	6
GEO	1	7	1		9
Harlaxton Energy Networks				1	1
Murphy Power Distribution			1		1
Northern Gas Networks			21		21
Network Rail		7	2	4	13
Northumbrian Water	10	18	2	26	56
Opal Telecom		33	3	33	69
United Utilities Water Limited	3	2			5
Virgin Media	5	4		3	12
Vodafone			1		1
Yorkshire Water	257	398	65	454	1,174
Utility Total	426	901	143	955	2,425

TABLE 50 AM 6 - LEVELS OF CUSTOMER ENQUIRIES.

This data is not available from the IT system at this time.

TABLE 51(A) KPI 4 THE NUMBER OF OCCURRENCES OF REDUCING THE APPLICATION PERIOD (EARLY STARTS). YEAR 1 (14 MONTHS)

This KPI shows where promoters start their works without having to comply with the minimum Permit application lead-in period, commonly known as early start agreements.

	Highway Authority	Utilities	Total
Feb	34	76	110
Mar	1	51	52
Apr	1	45	46
May		74	74
Jun		72	72
Jul		65	65
Aug		118	118
Sep	1	88	89
Oct		105	105
Nov		92	92
Dec		58	58
Jan		132	132
Feb		107	107
Mar		109	109
Total	2	1,065	1,067

TABLE 51(A) KPI 4 THE NUMBER OF OCCURRENCES OF REDUCING THE APPLICATION PERIOD (EARLY STARTS). YEAR 2

	Highway Authority	Utilities	Total
Apr		152	152
May		106	106
Jun		155	155
Jul		148	148
Aug		135	135
Sep		137	137
Oct		194	194
Nov		118	118
Dec		102	102
Jan		120	120
Feb		82	82
Mar		66	66
Total		1,515	1,515

TABLE 52 KPI 5 THE NUMBER OF AGREEMENTS TO WORK IN SECTION 58 AND SECTION 58A RESTRICTIONS.

This data is not available from the IT system at this time.

TABLE 53 KPI 6, THE PROPORTION OF TIMES THAT A PERMIT AUTHORITY INTERVENES ON APPLICATIONS.

Year 1 Percentage of time the Authority intervenes	4%
Year 2 Percentage of time the Authority intervenes	2%

APPENDIX 3 INCOME AND COSTS

FEE INCOME

The first-year report covers a 14-month period from the 1st February 2018 to the end of March 2019 inclusive.

The second-year report covers a 12-month period from the 1st April 2019 to the end of March 2020 inclusive.

In year 1 £1,364,004 of Permit and Permit Variation fee income was received.

In year 2 £1,702,398 of Permit and Permit Variation fee income was received.

Total fee income is increasing due to the increasing number of permit applications.

ALLOCATED COSTS

In year 1, £1,364,004 of costs were allocated to the Permit Scheme. This resulted in a balanced position.

In year 2, £1,370,772 of costs were allocated to the Permit Scheme. This resulted in a surplus of £331,626.

Costs are expected to rise over the coming years. Therefore, over the next 2 to 3 years a loss position is expected to arise unless costs are capped to income.

TABLE 55 AM 11 ALLOCATED COSTS

Operational Cost	Year 1	Year 2
Invoicing	£100,000	£120,000
IT support	£0	£6,750
Unauthorised/Abandoned works	£50,000	£50,000
Management Overhead	£763,567	£735,381
Staff	£450,437	£458,641
Totals	£1,364,004	£1,370,772

AVERAGE PERMIT COST AND COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS

By dividing the number of Permits applications by the Permit Scheme cost an average cost per Permit can be calculated.

This is a useful indicator of the general scheme costs to Utilities and can be compared to other schemes to show a general financial efficiency level.

These average Permit Costs are lower than the industry average of £50 to £70.

This is due to the charges being below average and below the maximum rates set by the DfT.

TABLE 56 AM 11 AVERAGE PERMIT COST, YEAR 1

Year 1 Total Permit Applications 41,379 (14 months)	Year 1 Total Scheme Cost £1,364,004	Year 1 Average Permit Cost £33
Year 2 Total Permit Applications 38,332	Year 2 Total Scheme Cost £1,370,772	Year 2 Average Permit Cost £36

TABLE 57 HIGHWAY AUTHORITY COST BENEFIT RESULTS. 5% REDUCTION IN WORKS IMPACT

Using the Halcrow Group report produced a report for the DfT on the impact of road works, quoted in DfT draft s Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA), July 2007, working up from the actual number of Noticed Works in North Yorkshire and using the ‘rule of thumb’ estimate from the DfT report of £600 per works per day and an average 6 days and the assumption that there is a 5% reduction in works due to the Permit Scheme, the projected annual benefits are detailed below.

Year 1 Costs £1,364,004	Year 1 Benefit £7,448,220	Year 1 Benefit to Cost Ratio 5.46:1
Year 2 Costs £1,370,772	Year 2 Benefit £6,899,760	Year 2 Benefit to Cost Ratio 5.03:1

END