

North Yorkshire Permit Scheme



NYoPS Consultation Report

CONTENTS

CONTENTS.....	2
1 Introduction	3
2 Summary of responses	4
3 Consultation distriution list	32

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The North Yorkshire Permit Scheme (“NYoPS”) formal consultation ran for an initial period of 3 months commencing on Monday 8th May 2017 ending Monday 7th August 2017. An online survey also completed the consultation process open to those affected by the introduction of the scheme as well as members of the public.
- 1.2 An informal consultation held by NYCC for Statutory Undertakers took place on Wednesday 3rd May 2017 to discuss the development and operation of the scheme. It provided an early opportunity to raise concerns ahead of the formal consultation offering a chance to review key elements of the scheme document. All Statutory Undertakers were asked to share details of the consultation with colleagues to gather as much feedback as possible.
- 1.3 The draft Scheme Document and accompanying covering letter were issued to 609 stakeholder organisation contacts including statutory consultees DfT, neighbouring Highway Authorities, Utilities and emergency services. A full list is provided within this document.
- 1.4 Some organisations had a number of consultees within them and if known those individuals were contacted directly. The total number of email addresses / individual contacts made was 538.
- 1.5 Of the consultees, there were 8 stakeholder organisations individual comments on the proposed Permit Scheme received by the deadline. The online survey received 179 total responses; however, of the 179 there were 10 complete responses, 2 of which from members of the public. There were 168 ‘incomplete responses’. This accounts for viewing the survey but not providing a response.
- 1.6 A list of responses to the consultation are compiled within this document. Some consultees wished for their names and responses to remain confidential and is therefore excluded from the report.

2 Summary of Responses

CONSULTATION RESPONSES			
<p>NOTE: Where responses were confidential, duplicates to those already covered under another respondent, contained unanswered question or were not relevant to the permit scheme, these are either not listed were or responded to separately.</p>			
Name / Organisation	Scheme Doc Ref	Comment	Response
Virgin Media	3.1.2	Virgin Media are disappointed that North Yorkshire Permit Scheme and associated fee`s will apply to all classification of roads. If the council chooses to apply permits to 100% of streets, contrary to advice from Ministers, Virgin Media requests that North Yorkshire grant permits for category 3 and 4 roads by default and for those permits to be at zero fee levels.	The charging mechanisms are set out by regulation and fees are allowed on all roads if required by the scheme. The fees set relate to North Yorkshire County Council's need to cover the costs of operation.
Virgin Media	9.4.4	Virgin Media acknowledges that a 50% discount Permit Fee may apply where works are carried out with collaborative working involving more than one Promoter/or trench sharing.	Noted
Virgin Media	15.4.4	Virgin Media acknowledge that North Yorkshire will be applying 50% discount for working outside Traffic sensitive times, However would request that works on Cat 3 and 4 roads are granted by default and those permits to be zero fee levels.	The charging mechanisms are set out by regulation and fees are allowed on all roads if required by the scheme. The fees set relate to North Yorkshire County Council's need to cover the costs of operation.
Virgin Media	15.4.5.2	Virgin Media acknowledge that North Yorkshire will adjust their fees accordingly if the overall income exceeds the allowable costs.	Yes – as required by regulations

Virgin Media	16.4.2	Will North Yorkshire be sending out draft invoices prior to the final invoice being generated, to avoid delay in case of any discrepancies?	NYCC will issue draft invoices prior to final invoicing
Northern Gas Network	6.2.5	This section suggests that details of road space occupancy is required on a PAA – could you please clarify whether this requirement will normally be satisfied by correct population of the dedicated Traffic Management Type field on the application, rather than by inclusion in the conditions. The HAUC (England) Guidance on the Operation of Permit Schemes (Feb 2017) indicates that NCT05a and NCT06a are for use by exception where there is a requirement to restrict works to a certain area, or maintain widths in excess of the statutory minimums.	Section 3.48 of the Statutory Guidance advises road occupancy should be included within the PAA, therefore it is strongly recommended this information be included in the application. Where the TM type field is not able to specify this clearly then more information should be provided using the free text fields such as the works description or comments. It is not necessary to provide conditions on a PAA.
Northern Gas Network	8.1 – Table 1	Table 1 includes the authority response times for permit applications and variations – can the authority please confirm that resources will allow for the provision of Permit Modification Requests early in the notice response period as recommended by the HAUC permit guidance.	NYCC will have resources in place to respond to all permit applications within the prescribed response period.
Northern Gas Network	9.2.6.2	This section states that on streets which are within category 0,1 or 2 and traffic sensitive details of the times of day an activity is to be carried out must be provided. The HAUC permit guidance states that the assumption is that activities will take place between 8am and 6pm Mon – Fri, and 8am to 1pm Sat, unless otherwise stated. Is the authority expecting these details to be provided when only working within these normal hours? Can the authority please clarify that this doesn't apply to traffic sensitive type 3, and 4 streets. This section contains the sentence "The start and end dates respectively on the permit". What is the meaning of this sentence?	Noted. 9.2.6.2 Re-phrased for clarity. Regarding HAUC advice on working hours (8.00-18.00 mon-fri and 08.00-13.00 Saturday) and the current guidance on working conditions, works may take place at any point within this period unless specified in the conditions (i.e. working outside traffic sensitive hours) and applies to both TS and non-TS streets.

Northern Gas Network	9.3.1	This section states that an early start must be applied for in the manner requested by the authority, which may be via initial phone call, or e-mail, or directly via EToN. The HAUC permit guidance sets out the recommended process for requesting early starts (Section 7). Can the authority please confirm whether they will be adopting this process? If not. Can they please confirm exactly what the process will be – i.e. what is “the manner requested by the authority”?	NYCC is happy to follow HAUC guidance until such time the process is not considered rigorous enough or believe is being misused.
Northern Gas Network	15.6.2	This section appears to be the completion of the paragraph started in 15.6.1 – can the authority please clarify? Should this working be included at the end of section 15.6.1, and section 15.6.2 be removed?	No. Each paragraph with the exception of bullet points has its own numbering for reference purposes.
Northern Gas Network	17.2	<p>The second bullet point relating to transitional arrangements states that activities planned to start more than one month after the start date of the scheme must be raised as permit applications. Cancelling and re-raising all Major works already planned and notified to start in months 2 and 3 commencement of the scheme will represent an significant duplication of workload for promoters, and create a significant workload for the authority in assessing the early starts that will be required when re-raising works as permit applications. Volumes of early start requests are seen as a performance indicator of works promoters noticing – this policy forces promoters to generate a large volume of early start requests at the outset of the permit scheme.</p> <p>We would ask the authority to consider revising the transitional arrangements to require only Standard and Minor works planned to start more than one month from the commencement of the scheme to be cancelled and re-raised</p>	Rules of transition are stated in section 9.7 of the Statutory Guidance and therefore NYoPS must adhere to this within the scheme document. However, a local agreement prior to the scheme start date with regards to certain works or specific categories might be agreed between NYCC and individual promoters. Promoters should contact NYCC following the end of the consultation.

		<p>as permits, and allow Major works already planned and noticed to start within three months of the commencements of the scheme to proceed under notices, and only Major works planned to start after this period to be cancelled and re-raised as permits.</p>	
<p>Northern Gas Network</p>	<p>Fee Matrices</p>	<p>It has been difficult to review the full details within the fee matrices, as some of the text within some of the tables in the downloadable pdfs is not readable – in particular the Permit Tasks and Permit Task descriptions on the “Fee matrix categories 1 and 2”, however items 5 on both the “Fee matrix categories 1 and 2”, and the “Fee matrix categories 3 and 4”, appear to include a number of activities which would appear to be covered by the authority’s responsibilities under Section 59 of NRSWA, and /or Part 2 of the Traffic Management Act, i.e. duties relating to Co-ordination and the Network Management Duties. For example, Item 5 a) under both the “Fee matrix categories 1 and 2”, and the “Fee matrix categories 3 and 4” would appear to cover the checking for other proposed activities which may clash with the proposed works, which would seem to a fundamental part of the duty under Section 59 of NRSWA. Also, the “Fee matrix – personnel” refers to cost aligned to Street Works Co-ordinators”. As per Section 6.5 of the Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes October 2015, costs aligned to the authority’s co-ordination duty under NRSWA is not an allowable cost under a permit scheme. Can the authority please clarify what elements of Co-ordination and the Networks Management Duty will continue to be carried out, without any cost applicable to the permit scheme, and what additional Co-ordination and Network Management</p>	<p>The matrix provides a broad-brush approach to analysing current practices and those tasks expected under permitting. It provides for the authority to estimate in general terms a reduction in the overall costs of each task based on current functions, resources and processes in relation to the expectations following permits and the likely personnel required. While North Yorkshire have been using their best endeavours to coordinate works, taking into account safety and inconvenience, given limited resources this has been restrained to the larger more disruptive activities only. NYCC considers the discounts applied in each activity task to be a reasonable representation overall of current practice, and in the wider context of the matrix this fits in existing workloads and resourcing.</p>

		Duties beyond those required under Section 59 of NRSWA and Part 2 of the TMA are being charged for under the permit scheme costs?	
Northern Gas Network	General	Can the authority please confirm that they will be abiding by the HAUC (England) Guidance on the Operation of Permit Schemes (Feb 2017)? Are any of the provisions of the HAUC (England) Guidance on the Operation of Permit Schemes (Feb 2017) to be written into the permit scheme document – for example the guidance gives direction on the appropriate use of Permit Modification Requests and Authority Imposed Variations, but the scheme document doesn't make any specific mention of Authority Imposed Variation notifications?	HAUC guidance is not Statutory guidance so may be used to support the operation of the NYoPS. NYCC will abide by all statutory legislation required to operate the NYoPS.
Network Rail	3.15	Network Rail would ask why this is not included under 9.1.3? The NRSWA code of Practice (1991) page 24 only states that the Authority is required to keep the register for Private Streets, not that the undertaker is required to serve notice? Please can this be clarified?	Section 9 is specific to making permit applications. As a notice is not a permit, it not considered suitable for this section. The Street Works (Registers, Notices, Directions and Designations) (England) Regulations 2007 section 4 "Street Works Registers" table 1 and 2 (point 2) shows the need for the undertaker to register works on non-maintainable highways.
Network Rail	3.5.1	Network Rail would request that we are included in this as we need to be contacted if working within 200m of our structures/assets	Noted
Network Rail	4.1	Typo – The TMA is 'Part 7' not Section	Amended
Network Rail	5.2.2.	Typo – there is a word missing – This should say 'registerable activities'	Amended

Network Rail	5.3.1	<p>1) Network Rail feels that this should read 'non registerable activities'</p> <p>2) Network Rail feel that this contradicts 5.2.1 'all activities that require the use of any form of temporary traffic management' and 'all activities that require a reduction in the width of the existing carriageway..'. Network Rail request that this be removed.</p>	<p>1) The term "registerable activities" corresponds to "specified works" under the Regulations. This has been amended for clarity in 5.2.1</p> <p>2) This advice is provided in the HAUC national guidance 2017.</p>
Network Rail	8.1.3	<p>Network Rail would ask that the reference to traffic sensitive streets is removed as this is not included in works categorisation in any primary legislation. According to the NRSWA COP 2012 page 51 'Works are categorised by duration'. The traffic sensitivity of the street has no bearing on the categorisation of works.</p>	<p>This sentence has been removed although the statutory guidance makes reference to fees set in relation to activities on 'busier roads'.</p>
Network Rail	8.2	<p>1) Network Rail seek clarification as to whether, in the event of a system failure, the authority will be implementing an interim strategy or agreeing an interim strategy with promoters?</p> <p>2) Network Rail seek clarification as to the penalties that may be issued as a result of resubmission following a system failure. Will these be waived?</p>	<p>In the event of system failures, Promoters may issue permit applications by alternative means, i.e. by fax, post and must comply with the requirements set out in the Technical Specification for EToN.</p> <p>In general penalties would not be applied normally for resubmitted notifications following logged system failures and suitable alternatives have been submitted in accordance with NYCC requirements.</p> <p>Penalties will not automatically be waived as a result of system failures where no attempt has been made to submit permit application via fax, email or post.</p>
Network Rail	9.2.4.1	<p>Network Rail request that this is included in the registration information required, as this is when this information is entered, not on the primary application.</p>	<p>Statutory Guidance (3.33) states Permit schemes should require that activity promoters provide their best estimate of the excavation depth as part of the application. This will not be removed from the scheme document. The expectation is all works will be</p>

			<p><1.5m and where >1.5 then this needs to be explicit within the works description.</p> <p>HAUC guidance also states depth as a requirement on a permit application (Section 2.2)</p>
Network Rail	9.2.5.1	Network Rail request that this is included in the registration information required, as this is when this information is entered, not on the primary application	Statutory Guidance (3.28) states that Permit schemes should require promoters to include an accurate location in their application based on National Grid References (NGRs). This will not be removed.
Network Rail	9.2.5.2	Networks Rail request an example of location text that matches an NGR	working “ o/s number 1 on the f/w” the then NGR should point to location outside number 1 on the f/w.
Network Rail	9.2.5.4	Typo - This should read ‘see section 7.5 & 8.1.3’	Amended
Network Rail	9.2.6.2	Network Rail request that this is removed as it appears to be a typo error	Removed
Network Rail	9.2.7.1	According to the HAUC (England) Guidance Operation of Permit Schemes Feb 2017 Page 17 2.2 ‘an illustration is required for a permit application’. Network Rail Would request that this is changed.	<p>HAUC guidance, section 2.2 in the first line under ‘Illustration’ it states “<i>Works promoters <u>may</u> need to provide an illustration of the works.</i>”</p> <p>Illustrations may not be required on every job where there is TM. Where NYCC considers the activity significant then illustrations will be requested.</p>
Network Rail	9.2.9.3	Typo – this should be Section 14	Amended
Network Rail	9.2.9.2	Network Rail seek further clarification of this section. Please can you clarify how the authority would like this to be presented? E.g. in a condition?	Section 9.2.9.1 states that “Certain traffic management proposals will also require suitable conditions detailing the constraints on these proposals”, therefore conditions are accepted.
Network Rail	9.2.19.1	Network Rail request that it be included that a permit modification will be sent to ensure relevant approval has been	NRSWA s.69 puts the onus on the undertaker to ensure all reasonably practicable steps are taken to

		gained to work in the vicinity of others apparatus.	<p>protect other apparatus and to also make reasonable inquiries in relation to that apparatus. Therefore, undertakers should seek to gain approval from the apparatus owners if it is identified (usually via pre-site surveys) that it may be affected as part of its work when planning activities.</p> <p>Where NYCC believe works may affect other apparatus then an instruction will be made to seek approval.</p>
Network Rail	12.1.5	Network rail argue that this is not what regulation 16(3) states. It states: 'If a permit authority does not grant or refuse a duly completed application within the applicable time limit, the application shall be deemed to have been granted...' There is no reference to promoters and statutory undertakers in this regulation. We believe this is from the National Permit Forum and is not in legislation. Please can this reference be removed?	Reworded to mirror EToN Spec: It should be noted that where a Modification Request is given as the response then this is considered a refusal under the Regulations if the promoter does not subsequently submit a modified application with the same start and end date as the original application
Network Rail	11.2.3	Network Rail would like to enquire where this advice has come from, as we are unable to locate this in any legislation, code of practice, statutory guidance or permit scheme? Please can this be removed	This has been re-phrased. NYCC will still need to mitigate disruption even if a permit has deemed, therefore reference to conditions/content has been removed only. Where the works are likely to cause problems in these ways it is inherent on NYCC to mitigate. NYCC would have every right to revoke the permit, irrespective of the fact it has deemed or not. In addition, there is the potential for substantial costs to the promoter if as a result of a deemed permit the WP arrive on site with thousands of pounds of TM only to find someone else there. Hence, NYCC will discuss with WP's if it is foreseen there is

			likely to be impact by working on a deemed permit.
Network Rail	12.2.2	Typo - This should read see 'section 9.3'	Amended
Network Rail	13.2	Network Rail would make a request to remove the first bullet point within this section. It has extremely negative connotations and we are unsure how this is quantifiable.	The word 'unrealistic' has been removed.
Network Rail	13.8	Network Rail would request that, as a permit cannot be suspended, can this wording be removed to simply read 'revoking a permit'	Amended
Network Rail	13.8.2	Network Rail feel that as different sections have been referred to as 'section xx' throughout, this should read 'Section 15' to maintain consistency.	'Chapter' is used when referring to the entire chapter and 'Section' for specific paragraph references. This has been reviewed and any necessary amendments made.
Network Rail	14.3.7	Please can you advise how this will be conditioned and how this will be monitored internally as we believe the TTROs are handled in a different location at the Authority?	By communicating with team members NYCC will be able to confirm if TTRO's are in place. There is a condition i.e. NCT07 available to ensure SU's must have TTRO's prior to commencing works.
Network Rail	14.6.1	Network Rail request that Utilities is changed to Activity promoter, as it is not just utilities that are submitting applications.	Amended to 'works promoters'
Network Rail	15.1.1	Network Rail request that this wording is amended to include 'upon submission of a Permit Application' as a PAA is not chargeable until a PA has been served as per the HAUC(England) Guidance Operation of Permit Schemes Feb 2017 Page 34 11.2	The wording of charges relating to PAA's has been amended to that of the 2007 Regulations.
Network Rail	15.4.4.3	Please could section 15.4.4.3 be examined further? Network Rail feel that this evidence would be covered by	This sentence states "...for instance photos or inspection records"..., therefore Inspectors

		<p>site inspections carried out by the Authority.</p>	<p>will undertake the necessary checks, however it is reasonable to expect that if a promoter wishes to seek discounts, they should provide their own evidence to make such claims. NYCC has no ability to inspect every single job, every single day on every period of TS.</p> <p>In addition, HAUC guidance suggests Works promoters should where their system allows indicate on their permit request that works will only take place outside of traffic sensitive time by de-selecting the relevant designation on the permit request; if this facility is not available, an appropriate comment should be sent. The fee will be based on this information and not on what a promoter says has happened after the event, it is therefore important to make applications as accurate as possible.</p>
Network Rail	16.2.1	<p>Network Rail ask please could you expand on what processes will be used to resolve problems informally?</p>	<p>Discussions can be held between the works promoter and NYCC in an attempt to resolve any problems.</p>
Network Rail	16.5.2	<p>Network Rail ask please could you expand on how persistent offending and informal failure will be defined? How will this be decided?</p>	<p>'Persistent' in its definition does not have a number; therefore, we are unable to define the number of offences before prosecution is an option. Where ongoing offences have been identified and raised with the works promoter, NYCC will attempt to resolve the issues locally and prosecute as a last resort.</p>
Network Rail	17.3	<p>Network Rail would like to enquire as to the reasoning behind the lack of a transitional or grace period at the start of the scheme?</p>	<p>Rules of transition are stated in section 9.7 of the statutory guidance and therefore NYoPS must adhere to this within the scheme document. However, a local agreement prior to the</p>

			<p>scheme start date with regards to certain works types or specific categories might be agreed between NYCC and individual promoters. Promoters should contact NYCC following the end of the consultation.</p>
Network Rail	Appendix D	Network Rail welcome the sensible pricing strategy.	Noted
Network Rail	Appendix A	<p>1) Network Rail feel that there should be one term listed for conditions and that this should be NCT's for consistency and to avoid confusion. 2) It seems unnecessary to have 'emergency works' in the appendix 3) 'Breaking up' & 'excavation' refer to the same thing. This is a duplication</p>	<p>Removed standard /model condition. Amended 'Permit Conditions' to state "These conditions are set out in Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes – Permit Scheme Conditions (March 2015)"</p> <p>'emergency works' included to show its definition as those identified in NRSWA s.52</p> <p>The two terms are referenced as such throughout the statutory guidance; it will therefore remain as shown.</p>
Network Rail	Cost Benefit Analysis	<p>Network Rail feel the data provided in the cost benefit analysis was very difficult to understand and lacking in scales and keys that would have aided understanding further.</p> <p>1) Please can you clarify where this data has come from as only one of the figures (Permit application employee costs) matches figures anywhere else in the data provided? 2) Please can you advise who the permit application numbers apply to as the figures given do not add up? When we have worked out the variation costs as per your data we have come up with a figure of £56775 whereas your figures state a cost of £53579? 3) Please can you advise what the total permit numbers are based on? 4) Network Rail would like to enquire why a rise of over 1000 applications is</p>	<p>The matrix uses data held in the gazetteer and is based on SU activities. The calculations are supplied by DfT and provides a broad-brush approach to analysing current practices and those tasks expected under permitting. It provides for the authority to estimate in general terms a reduction in the overall costs of each task based on current functions, resources and processes in relation to the expectations following permits and the likely personnel required. While North Yorkshire have been using their best endeavours to coordinate works, taking into account safety</p>

		<p>expected under the permitting scheme? Please can you advise why the Streetworks Coordinators hours will be significantly increased under a permitting scheme?</p>	<p>and inconvenience, given limited resources this has been restrained to the larger more disruptive activities only. NYCC considers the discounts applied in each activity task to be a reasonable and the fees a fair representation overall of current practice, and in the wider context of the matrix this fits in with existing workloads and resourcing.</p>
--	--	--	---

NYoPS online consultation survey			
Name / Organisation		Comment	Response
1. Had you heard of the Permit Scheme before?			
C. Nash		No	Noted
East Riding of Yorkshire Council		Yes	Noted
C. Galliland		Yes	Noted
Vodafone		Yes	Noted
Yorkshire Water		Yes	Noted
Field and Civil Engineering Ltd		Yes	Noted
Northern Powergrid		Yes	Noted
2. Do you consider that a Permit Scheme is suited to the needs of North Yorkshire?			
C. Nash		Yes	Noted

<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council</p>		<p>Other: North Yorkshire is a largely rural authority and the imposition of permitting on all roads may be onerous</p>	<p>Thank you for your response to North Yorkshire County Council's permit scheme consultation.</p> <p>The introduction of the North Yorkshire Permit Scheme (NYoPS) has the potential to improve management of all works on local road networks, as well as significantly reduce unnecessary disruption to road users and increase safety for all road users.</p> <p>It is accepted there is greater administration required in operating a permit scheme and North Yorkshire will put in place additional resources in order to manage the scheme and its network effectively.</p> <p>Applying the permit scheme throughout the whole network means an additional benefit of this approach is a more holistic network management function as opposed to operating a dual function of notices and permits, meaning the management and coordination of activities across the network might be unsatisfactory.</p> <p>North Yorkshire is not the first rural county to introduce a permit scheme and the increased discipline required under the permitting regime has improved existing processes within promoter organisations, which has enhanced the quality of information relating to proposed works received by permit authorities. Greater focus and effort</p>
---	--	---	---

			<p>will also be paid to coordinating works on traffic sensitive streets.</p> <p>We hope your questions or concerns regarding the NYoPS introduction have been addressed.</p>
C. Galliland		Yes	Noted
Vodafone		<p>Other: As a vast area, there are many rural roads within NYPS that will be affected by your proposal to designate all streets as permit streets for no good reason. The effects on your resource to assess each and every application will mean an army of extra administration staff or this could lead to the TP-6 indicator show the scheme is not meeting its targets. A better, more considered alternative would be for Traffic Sensitive streets and Strategic Roads to be Permittable leaving your resource to focus effectively on where the likely disruption occurs.</p>	<p>Applying the permit scheme throughout the whole network means an additional benefit of this approach is a more holistic network management function as opposed to operating a dual function of notices and permits, meaning the management and coordination of activities across the network might be unsatisfactory.</p> <p>North Yorkshire is not the first rural county to introduce a permit scheme that applies throughout the entire network and it is accepted there is greater administration required in operating a permit scheme. North Yorkshire will put in place additional resources in order to manage the scheme and its network effectively and greater focus and effort will also be paid to managing works on traffic sensitive streets.</p>
Yorkshire Water		<p>Other: The aims and objectives of the NYCC Permit Scheme are understood and agreeable as all parties strive to reduce disruption to highway users. However our obligations to maintain and enhance our water and waste networks and asset infrastructure must also be considered. We would question</p>	<p>It is accepted there is greater administration required in operating a permit scheme and North Yorkshire will also put in place additional resources in order to</p>

		<p>the requirement for a blanket all streets approach. Why, for instance, would a non-traffic sensitive type 3 or 4 road be deemed necessary to require the extra level of scrutiny and cost of a permit. For Yorkshire Water to manage the proposed scheme would mean additional resources, in addition to the permit fees, in order to support the requirements of the scheme. For example, planning and ensuring conditions are being met.</p>	<p>manage the scheme and its network effectively.</p> <p>Applying the permit scheme throughout the whole network means an additional benefit of this approach is a more holistic network management function as opposed to operating a dual function of notices and permits, meaning the management and coordination of activities across the network might be unsatisfactory.</p> <p>North Yorkshire is not the first rural county to introduce a permit scheme and the increased discipline required under the permitting regime has improved existing processes within promoter organisations, which has enhanced the quality of information relating to proposed works received by permit authorities.</p>
Field and Civil Engineering Ltd		Other: Unsure, the information provided deals with a lot of internal requirements it is not clear exactly what impact it will have on us, utility companies and the general public	Please see full response under Question 11.
Northern Powergrid		Yes	Noted
3. Do you think the Permit Scheme reflects the statutory guidance for permits?			
C. Nash		Other: Do not know	Noted

North Yorkshire County Council NYoPS Consultation Report

East Riding of Yorkshire Council		Other	Noted
C. Galliland		Yes	Noted
Vodafone		Yes	Noted
Yorkshire Water		Other: Further clarity would be appreciated regarding the fees proposed and the DfT guidance regarding maximum permit fees i.e. Appendix D and the Fee Matrix Scheme Cost Document. The costs within the two documents above differ on some categories.	The Fee Matrix Scheme Cost document sets out how permit fees are calculated as well as the <u>maximum</u> fees allowed to be charged per category of works. NYCC's fees set out in Appendix D differ from those in the Fee Matrix document as we are not charging the maximum fees provided for operating a permit scheme. NYCC believe the fees set in Appendix D are fair in relation to managing the NYoPS.
Field and Civil Engineering Ltd.		Yes	Noted
Northern Powergrid		Yes	Noted
4. Do you think the Permit Scheme accurately reflects the requirements of The Traffic Management Permit Scheme (England) Regulations 2007 as amended 2015?			
C. Nash		Other: Do not know	Noted
East Riding of Yorkshire Council		No response received	n/a
C. Galliland		Yes	Noted
Vodafone		Yes	Noted

North Yorkshire County Council NYoPS Consultation Report

Yorkshire Water		Yes	Noted
Field and Civil Engineering Ltd.		Yes	Noted
Northern Powergrid		Yes	Noted
5. Do you understand what conditions may be applied in granting a permit?			
C. Nash		Yes	Noted
East Riding of Yorkshire Council		Yes	Noted
C. Galliland		Yes	Noted
Vodafone		Yes	Noted
Yorkshire Water		Other: Can you please clarify that the proposed permit scheme will adhere to the conditions set out in "HAUC (England) Guidance – Operation of Permit Schemes February 2017". Rather than Appendix C – which states the March 2015 document (Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit schemes – Permit Scheme Conditions) must be followed.	The NYoPS document must comply with statutory guidance issued 2015. The HAUC (England) Guidance – Operation of Permit Schemes February 2017 is not statutory guidance but will be used to support the operation of the NYoPS.
Field and Civil Engineering Ltd.		Other: Layman terms need to be used, crib sheet guidance notes, timescales for how much notice on each type of permit and the applicable fee, it is not clear from the information provided	Please see full response under Question 11
Northern Powergrid		Yes	Noted
6. Are the penalties for not correctly applying for a			

permit clearly identified?			
C. Nash		Yes	Noted
East Riding of Yorkshire Council		Yes	Noted
C. Galliland		Yes	Noted
Vodafone		Yes	Noted
Yorkshire Water		Yes	Noted
Field and Civil Engineering Ltd.		Other: I could not see what the penalties were and when they would be applied, again a brief guidance crib sheet is required, an example application would be helpful to enable us to work out how the permit process will work	Please see full response under Question 11.
Northern Powergrid		Yes	Noted
7. Are the penalties for not abiding by permit conditions clearly identified?			
C. Nash		Yes	Noted
East Riding of Yorkshire Council		Yes	Noted
C. Galliland		Yes	Noted
Vodafone		Yes	Noted
Yorkshire Water		Other: The penalties appear onerous for type 3 / 4 non traffic sensitive road where we have a fully compliant site (Red Book) but inaccurate information provided on EToN. For example permit submitted for some carriageway incursion where in reality it should state "five and take"	Permit Applications must be an accurate reflection of what is taking place on site and EToN provides various TM types to reflect proposed works. FPN's will apply to all road categories.
Field and Civil Engineering Ltd.		Other: I could not see what the penalties were and when they would be applied, again a brief guidance crib sheet is required, an example application would be helpful to enable us to work out how the permit process will work	Please see a full response under Question 11

North Yorkshire County Council NYoPS Consultation Report

Northern Powergrid		Yes	Noted
8. Do you think that the monitoring proposed for the Scheme is adequate?			
C. Nash		Other: In objectives, it says these include safety and disability access, but the monitoring criteria don't seem to include anything to measure the impact of the scheme on this.	See response in question 10
East Riding of Yorkshire Council		Yes	Noted
C. Galliland		Yes	Noted
Vodafone		Yes	Noted
Yorkshire Water		Other: We are not entirely sure what the details of the proposed monitoring for the scheme are so would appreciate further explanation of this element	<p>The TPI's for monitoring permits schemes are provided within the Statutory Guidance. Specifically parity has previously been measured on early starts and extension requests and condition usage and these are things monitored also as part of the wider street works remit. Asset protection comes in to the NRSWA statutory requirement under S59(1)(C).</p> <p>Regulations require NYCC to produce a report every year for the first three years of the scheme followed by every three years thereafter that outlines how the scheme objectives are being achieved. This will be made available to consultees via the NYCC website and to those with a general interest in the scheme.</p>
Field and Civil Engineering Ltd.		Yes	Noted
Northern Powergrid		Yes	noted

9. Do you understand the transition arrangements for the Permit Scheme?			
C. Nash		Yes	Noted
East Riding of Yorkshire Council		Yes	Noted
C. Galliland		Yes	Noted
Vodafone		Yes	Noted
Yorkshire Water		Other: We understand that a 1 month transition period will be introduced. We will have a number of major works planned more than 1 month ahead at the scheme introduction date. For example, we currently have nine schemes across NYCC area with a start date of November 2017. Does this now mean that these will need cancelling and re-issuing with potential disruption to customers, developers and other third parties. The transition up to the start date will also need further managing. We consider that a transitional 3 month period should be introduced at the start of the scheme relating to fixed penalty notices to allow not only Yorkshire Water by also NYCC to become more familiar with the scheme before they are applied in full. This is the approach taken by other Highway Authorities within our region and has worked well.	Rules of transition are stated in section 9.7 of the statutory guidance and therefore NYoPS must adhere to this within the scheme document. However, a local agreement prior to the scheme start date with regards to certain works types or specific categories might be agreed between NYCC and individual promoters. Promoters should contact NYCC following the end of the consultation. Works with notices submitted after the transition date can continue as a notice but must be cancelled and issued as a permit where an early start can be agreed.
Field and Civil Engineering Ltd.		Other: No, too much information not relevant to the users was provided to seek out that information	Please see a full response under Question 11
Northern Powergrid		Other: It is preferable that the transition period be extended to cover Major works that are planned to start within 3 months of the changeover date. If this is not the case can you give assurances that early starts will be granted for Major Works where a 3 month notice has been sent before the changeover and are planned to start within 3 months of the changeover.	Rules of transition are stated in section 9.7 of the statutory guidance and therefore NYoPS must adhere to this within the scheme document. However, a local agreement prior to the scheme start date with regards to certain works types or specific categories might be agreed between NYCC and individual

			<p>promoters. Promoters should contact NYCC following the end of the consultation.</p>
<p>10. Are there any aspects of the Permit Scheme that require further clarification?</p>			
<p>C. Nash</p>		<p>Other:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does this apply to closures of streets for cleansing, it appears to. This will have an impact on cleansing of certain streets where part of the highway has to be briefly closed. 2. Why 50% discount? Is this best practice across the country? Is this more likely to change behaviour than 60% or 40%? It seems to be a very crude figure and no reason or justification for the level of discount is given. What consultation will be carried out if it is decided to vary this figure? 3. In most places, only streets are mentioned, rather than highways in general, but in 14.1.2, the document says, "in less urgent cases the Authority may make a 'temporary order', which may remain in force for up to 18 months. This is limited to six months for footpaths, bridleways, cycle tracks and byways open to all traffic." This implies that the permit scheme will apply to these categories, or else why mention them> Also in 16.1.1 the document again refers to highways as well as to streets. So it is not clear if it does or doesn't apply to footpaths and bridleways. I object strongly if it does, as this will make maintaining footpaths and bridleways much more expensive 	<p>Dear Ms Nash,</p> <p>Thank you for your response to North Yorkshire County Council's permit scheme consultation.</p> <p>The introduction of the North Yorkshire Permit Scheme (NYoPS) has the potential to improve management of all works on local road networks, as well as significantly reduce unnecessary disruption to road users and increase safety for all road users. The scheme only applies to utility works (Statutory Undertakers) and works for road purposes (WRP's - highway maintenance), although in the wider context it will improve general coordination between many elements of the council (development control e.g. licenced activities like scaffolding and cranes), highway events etc.</p> <p>One of the scheme's primary objectives is to ensure the safety of those using the street and those working on activities that fall under the scheme, with a particular emphasis on people with disabilities. North Yorkshire's Street Works Inspectors monitor</p>

and difficult with huge impacts on safety as some maintenance work simply won't be done. There is mention of all activities that require a Temporary Traffic Order, which some works to footpath and bridleways do.

I'm not clear about the status of maintenance work to Canal and River Trust swing bridges under the phrase "street works"/ I live near two of these. They close the highway off anyway at regular intervals during the day without notification, and when they are broken, they close the highway automatically and won't open until maintained, so it would seem rather odd to require payment for a permit to close them for maintenance.

this through mandatory safety inspections at all work sites.

All works activities carried out on North Yorkshire's network must comply with specifications detailed in 'Safety at Street Works and Road Works' Code of Practice. Where works are on a footway, typically a clearance of 1.2 meters is maintained although the legal minimum of 1 meter unobstructed width must be left for pedestrians. This is to ensure sufficient space for wheelchair users, mobility scooters, buggies and prams.

North Yorkshire will have additional powers to impose site specific conditions such as setting working hours, durations and site access, and failing to comply with the Code of Practice or breaching conditions will result in remedial action imposed on the works site owners to address faults or safety concerns and a Fixed Penalty Notice issued.

Further clarification on aspects of the Permit Scheme

To address your points where you required further clarification on other aspects of the scheme:

1. Closures under the NYoPS apply to Street Works and Road Works only and does not apply to closures required for Street Cleansing. This is managed elsewhere within the County Council.
2. The Department for Transport requires all Permit Schemes to offer a minimum of 30% discount

			<p>to Statutory Undertakers as an incentive to manage works efficiently. Across the industry and after previous consultations between Highway Authorities operating Permit Schemes and Utilities, it is felt a 50% was fair and acceptable to both parties. Following discussions within the County Council and Statutory Undertakers it was agreed to adopt the same approach. Any change to the discount applied will be consulted with Utilities.</p> <p>3. This section sets out the legal element of a TTRO/TTRN and any closures required due to road / street works are limited to the duration of the jobs. These provisions are already in place under the existing law and it will not change the manner in which footpaths and bridleways are maintained. Permits for road works (WRP's) are not chargeable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In this case streets refer to any highway (which includes any route or path with a public right of access, including footpaths and bridleways etc.) road, lane, footway, alley or passage. Therefore a street may not be a highway. <p>4. Maintenance and closures to Canal and River Trust</p>
--	--	--	---

North Yorkshire County Council NYoPS Consultation Report

			Swing bridges are not covered under the NYoPS.
East Riding of Yorkshire Council		No	Noted
C. Galliland		No	Noted
Vodafone		Other: We would like to understand how the scheme objectives will be met under 2.1 using the TPI Appendix E as they are not related in anyway to show and demonstrate such. As examples – “protect the structure of the street and the integrity of apparatus in it” or ‘ensure parity of treatment for all activity promoters” – which TP monitors these?	The TPI’s for monitoring permits schemes are provided within the Statutory Guidance. Specifically parity has previously been measured on early starts and extension requests and condition usage and these are things monitored also as part of the wider street works remit. Asset protection comes in to the NRSWA statutory requirement under S59(1)(C)
Yorkshire Water		Other: We have detailed in the above sections. We are also currently reviewing your traffic sensitive street changes and are in consultation regarding this.	Noted.
Field and Civil Engineering Ltd.		Other: Laymans guidance notes are required, so we can identify what permit we are applying for, how much notice is required and what fee, plus what penalties are incurred and why	Please see a full response under Question 11
Northern Powergrid		Yes	Noted
11. Do you have any other questions on the Permit Scheme? Please can you explain your reasons or add any additional comments you would like to make below.			

C. Nash		Other:	n/a
East Riding of Yorkshire Council		Other:	n/a
C. Galliland		Other: As a member of the public it is vital to know when and for how long the traffic will be disrupted and for not too many works to be going on at the same time on the same route. Also over runs need to be monitored and cones with no work	<p>Dear Mr Gilliland,</p> <p>Thank you for your response to North Yorkshire County Council's permit scheme consultation.</p> <p>The introduction of the North Yorkshire Permit Scheme (NYoPS) has the potential to improve management of all works on local road networks, as well as significantly reduce unnecessary disruption to road users and increase safety for all road users.</p> <p>Permit schemes differ from existing powers for managing activities on the street in a number of key activities, in particular;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory Undertakers and Authority works promoters must book occupation of a street rather than give notice. This gives NYCC greater control of works and allows for better coordination and collaborative working arrangements to take place. • Permit boards must be displayed across <u>all</u> works activities. This provides information on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who is undertaking the work ○ Start and end date of works, and; • Conditions may be imposed upon works activities by NYCC to better control timings of work i.e. limiting

			<p>works during traffic sensitive times on traffic sensitive streets</p> <p>The increased discipline required under the permitting regime has improved existing processes within promoter organisations for permitting authorities, which has enhanced the quality of information relating to proposed works received by permit authorities. Greater focus and effort will also be paid to coordinating works on traffic sensitive streets to minimise disruption.</p> <p>We hope your questions or concerns regarding the NYoPS introduction have been addressed.</p>
Vodafone		Other: We would like to see an Operations Group assemble from key undertakers and the authority to ensure the permit scheme works for all.	North Yorkshire have developed a scheme in line with statutory legislation which it considers fair for all and are happy to work with promoters to ensure the schemes success.
Yorkshire Water		Other: Yorkshire Water understands the aims and objectives and the scheme and will work with NYCC to reduce disruption to our joint customers. We have carried some initial analysis on the impact it will have on our operations in North Yorkshire. We absolutely understand the challenges of managing in such a large geographical area. As a regulated business we have obligations to our customers and to our regulators such as OFWAT; The Drinking Water Inspectorate the HSE; The Environment Agency as well as NYCC. In meeting our 26 Performance Commitments to customers we do have to work within the highway to maintain and manage our underground assets. The direct impact of the permit fees will be in the region of £400,000 in	<p>NRSWA and TMA operate under the same noticing periods and Section 9.3 of the scheme document sets in place provisions for early starts, therefore where possible, NYCC will allow a reduction in the required notice period for non-urgent but customer sensitive works to take place.</p> <p>A 3-month mandatory consultation has taken place between May 8th 2017 and August 7th 2017. All eligible comments have been considered and where required and within legislation, amendments have been made to the scheme document. A report will be</p>

		<p>addition to the costs incurred in planning/scheduling etc. We are also conscious of a potential impact on timescales of carrying out non-urgent but customer sensitive works – will the permit scheme increase job completion timescales in some instances? We have not been able to assess this but believe it is a risk to our service delivery. Can the Permit Scheme commencement date (proposed 4th October 2017) be confirmed. Can you please confirm the next stages of the Consultation?</p>	<p>circulated to all consultees with a summary of the consultation along with comments and feedback and this will conclude the consultation process.</p> <p>The ‘Go-live’ date of the NYoPS has been postponed to November however the exact date will be communicated with all consultees prior to the ‘Letter of Intent’ is issued 4 weeks in advance of go-live. The scheme document will be updated to reflect this change.</p>
<p>Field and Civil Engineering Ltd.</p>		<p>Other: Please send an example of the permit application</p>	<p>Thank you for your response to North Yorkshire County Council’s permit scheme consultation.</p> <p>The introduction of the North Yorkshire Permit Scheme (NYoPS) has the potential to improve management of all works on local road networks and significantly reduce unnecessary disruption to road users. The new powers granted under Part 3 of the Traffic Management Act (TMA) 2004 will allow North Yorkshire to agree conditions to ensure that works are expedited and are undertaken in the most efficient manner, and the combined effect of powers under TMA and the New Roads and Street Works Act (NRSWA) 1991 has been to contribute to improved coordination and reduce disruption.</p> <p>Currently, Statutory Undertakers operating under the NRSWA noticing system will be required to submit permit applications as outlined in the Permit Scheme document; details of which are provided below. Non-statutory works promoters operating under</p>

S.50 licensing will continue to do so and apply for a S.50 license to carry out works on the highway.

Requirements for both Permit applications and S.50 applications are the same with the exception of 'Conditions' and 'Permit boards' only applicable to Permits, and the look and feel of a Permit application is similar to that of a NRSWA notice but includes additional functions to send and receive Permit responses.

Regarding the general public, there is no direct impact. Moreover, it is expected that the public will benefit from the NYoPS by seeing an improvement in journey time reliability and reduced congestion as well as promoting a safer environment.

The proposed NYoPS permit scheme document can be found at <http://www.northyorks.gov.uk/article/33783> labelled '*North Yorkshire Highways Works Permit Scheme*'.

Here you will find detailed information and guidance where you required clarification on:

- Timescales and notification requirements for each permit type
- Permit Conditions
- Permit Fees
- Permit Offences and Sanctions
- Transitional Arrangements

We hope your questions or concerns regarding the NYoPS introduction have been addressed and would recommend reviewing the scheme document to provide further information.

			Should there be any further questions, please send these to nycc.permitconsultation@northyork.s.gov.uk for a response.
Northern Powergrid		Other: 5.2.2 Bar Holes can also be used in the electricity industry to detect cable faults. 8.1.3. The statement about traffic sensitive streets is incorrect, it has no bearing on the minimum application timescale which is based on duration. 9.2.9.2 Temporary Traffic Signals (TTS) should be Portable Traffic Signals (PTS) 9.2.9.2. This should refer to section 14 not 17, Section 12 there is no mention of the fact that immediate applications cannot be refused, they should be managed via an AIV. Section 14 do you mean Traffic Regulation Order not restriction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5.22: This has been amended to include "or to detect cable faults" - 8.1.3: This has been removed although the statutory guidance makes reference to fees set in relation to activities on 'busier roads' - 9.2.9.2: Amended to 'PTS' <p>Section 12: Non refusal of immediate permits are considered best practice not statutory legislation. NYCC will follow HAUC guidance in relation to responding to issues with Immediate permits but may refuse immediate permits where there are significant errors i.e. the permit was applied for on the wrong street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 14: Amended to 'Regulation'
Other Comments			
Environment Agency		<p>Thank you for the consultation documents. I have passed your enquiry to our Sustainable Places team for the relevant area and they will be in touch with you shortly.</p> <p>The Freedom of Information Act and Environmental Information Regulations stat that a public authority must respond to requests for information within 20 working days, but we aim to respond to all enquiries as quickly as we can.</p> <p>You can find more information about our service commitment by clicking on the link below: <i>(removed)</i></p> <p>Should you wish to contact the Sustainable Places team directly, please use the contact details below. Please quote your Enquiry Reference</p>	Noted

		(<i>removed</i>) in any correspondence with us regarding this matter.	
Woodhouse-Barry (Construction) Ltd		Dear sirs. As a Construction company, we periodically need to work in the highway to connect into Yorkshire Water sewage and surface water connections. Do we need to be part of the scheme to undertake these works?	Dear Ms Hawkswell. Thank you for your response to our consultation. Should Woodhouse-Barry Ltd require to work on the highway, a s.50 licence must be applied for to undertake works. This will require the same information as a Permit application and will follow the same review and approval process. Alternatively, Yorkshire Water may apply for a permit to undertake works on your behalf.

3 Consultation Distribution List

- Secretary of State (DfT)
- Country Landowners Association
- DEFRA
- Natural England
- Highways England Company Ltd
- Network Rail
- Department for Transport
- National JAG
- National JUG
- English Heritage
- North Yorkshire Police
- North York Moors National Park
- Yorkshire Dales National Park
- Yorkshire Ambulance Service
- North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue
- Environment Agency
- Tourism Association North Yorkshire
- North Yorkshire Moors Association
- Yorkshire Archaeological & Historical Society
- Primary Care Trust
- West & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
- National Farmers Union
- British Horse Society (Yorkshire)
- CPRE (Yorkshire)
- The Inland Waterways Association
- Yorkshire Local Councils Association
- York city
- East Riding of Yorkshire
- Redcar and Cleveland
- Middlesborough Council
- Stockton On Tees Borough Council
- Hartlepool Borough Council
- Darlington Borough
- Durham County Council
- Cumbria County Council
- Lancashire County Council
- Kirklees Metropolitan Council
- Calderdale
- Bradford
- Leeds City Council
- Wakefield
- North Lincolnshire
- Richmondshire District Council
- Hambleton District Council
- Scarborough Borough Council
- Ryedale District Council
- Craven district Council
- Harrogate Borough Council
- Selby District Council
- National Grid Gas Distribution Limited
- BT
- CABLE AND WIRELESS UK
- Northern Powergrid (Yorkshire) plc
- ELECTRICITY NORTH WEST
- Northern Powergrid (Northeast) Limited
- National Grid Electric PLC
- Shell / BP Pipelines
- Vodafone
- Mainline Pipelines
- NETWORK RAIL - PROMOTERS NATIONAL
- VIRGIN MEDIA
- Telefonica (O2 (UK) Limited)
- Independent Pipelines Limited
- Romec
- GAS TRANSPORTATION CO LTD
- Orange PCS Group
- T-Mobile (UK) Limited
- ES Pipelines Ltd
- Northern Gas Networks
- Independent Power Networks Ltd
- Fulcrum Pipelines Limited
- ESP Electricity Ltd
- UK Broadband
- Broadband for the Rural North (B4RN)
- NORTHUMBRIAN WATER
- UNITED UTILITIES WATER LIMITED
- Yorkshire Water
- S&A Doughty
- Tony Hudson Plant & Excavation Ltd,
- Belcon Civil Engineering Ltd
- Luke Scargall
- Eco Drill (England) Ltd
- CTW Construction Ltd
- Calder Cad Ltd,
- G Snowball & Son Ltd
- RN Wooler & Co Ltd,
- Eastwood Construction & Engineering Services
- Shellmoor Civil Engineering Ltd,
- P&T Contracts

- Mark Stubbs
- GBH Utilities
- Hutchinson Environmental Solutions,
- Rob Marshall, RE Marsahl Ltd
- J Thackray & Sons Ltd
- R.M.Carson Groundworks
- Peter Duffy Limited
- A.E.Duffield & Sons Ltd,
- Durkan & Sons
- R.B.A Moody Bros (Contractors) Ltd,
- 2Works utilities and TM
- Q-Free TDC
- Biker Group
- Anwen Construction
- J Thackray & Sons Ltd,
- Patrick D Holme Groundworks
- Wilf Nobles Construction Ltd
- Steve Murphy
- Chris Waldron
- Norcon Construction Limited
- James Hurrell (MSL) Moorehead Sutton & Laing
- Supamole Ltd
- Murphy utilities Ltd
- Eastwood Civils & Groundworks
- James Ford
- Doocey North East Ltd
- Supamole Ltd,
- MW Maintenance Ltd
- Mulgrave Properties
- PN Daly (Ingleby Water Company Ltd),
- Drake Plant Hire
- Hagrapat Ltd,
- Buckingham Group Ltd
- Pathways of Scarborough Ltd
- 'hargrave Builders
- Eric Greaves ES Gas Associates
- Alfa Site Services Limited
- Marcus Metcalfe, TRANSCORE LIMITED BUILDING AND CIVIL ENGINEERING CONTRACTORS
- Robin Ellis Construction Ltd
- DYNO Rod
- Jackson Plant Ltd,
- Stockdale Construction Ltd,
- Adroit Utilities Ltd
- Hacs Construction
- County Contractors
- NJC Yorkshire Ltd,
- Aptus Utilities,
- H Construction
- Candelisa Ltd
- Collette Wilson. Hughie Construction Ltd
- Drainsaid,
- Dalebuild Ltd
- Daniel Gath Homes Ltd
- David Holmes Developments
- ESH Property Services
- L&D Construction
- Field and Civil Engineering Limited
- Keepsake Construction
- Clancy Docwra Ltd
- Whitelock Developments Ltd
- Geocore Site Investigation Ltd
- , Sabic UK Ltd International,
- Gerald Smith
- GEW2
- A.E.Duffield & Sons Ltd
- High Voltage Systems & Services
- BBUSL
- Imperial Mews Ltd,
- Integrated Utility Services
- MJ Ramsay Plant Hire
- SE Copsey Groundworks Ltd,
- Wyn Construction Ltd
- Ken Rodney Construction
- Transcore Ltd
- Kier Living Ltd
- LAL Projects Ltd
- Lumsden & Carrol Civil Engineering
- James Ford Drainage Matrix Networks(Renewables)
- Stainforth Construction
- C.G.Godfrey Ltd
- L & W Wilson Ltd
- UK Power Solutions
- Athena Civil Engineering Ltd
- W T Parker Ltd
- Ridding Construction
- Mr & Mrs J G Milton
- S & B Utilities Ltd
- Aztec Joinery and building
- Clayhill Construction
- ARB Civils and Groundworks Ltd
- New Utility Connections Ltd
- New Lodge Contractors Ltd
- Addison Plant Ltd
- Dalebuild Ltd
- 2 Works Utilities
- Persimmon Homes
- Multiserve Utilities
- PN Daly Ltd
- Steven Foster
- yorkshire pro paving & Groundworks
- kenneth Michael Dowson
- Manterfield Drilling
- Topp and Holmes Builders Ltd
- WP Sutcliffe
- Robin Hunt
- Bouyges E&S Infrastructure UK Ltd,
- Skipton Properties Ltd
- Soil Engineering
- Squire Energy Limited

- Maude Construction Ltd
- SPH Civils
- Strategic Team Group
- Structural Soils Ltd
- RCD Utility Services Ltd
- Megson Utilities Ltd
- Woodhouse Barry Construction Ltd
- South Yorkshire Tarmacadam Ltd
- Alan King
- ESH Border Construction
- Yorvik Homes Ltd
- Cllr Val Arnold
- Cllr Margaret Atkinson
- Cllr Andrew Backhouse
- Cllr Robert Baker
- Cllr Arthur Barker
- Cllr Phillip Barrett
- Cllr Derek Bastiman
- cllr Bernard bateman
- cllr david billing
- cllr john blackburn
- cllr john blackie
- cllr david blades
- cllr eric broadbent
- cllr lindsay burr
- cllr Jean Butterfield
- cllr elizabeth casling
- cllr david chance
- cllr jim clark
- cllr richard cooper
- cllr sam cross
- cllr john clark
- cllr gareth dadd
- cllr margaret-ann de courcey-bayley
- cllt caroline dickinson
- cllr john ennis
- cllr john fort
- cllr andrew goss
- cllr helen grant
- cllr bryn griffiths
- cllr michael harrison
- cllr roger harrison-topham
- cllr robert heseltine
- cllr peter horton
- cllr bill houlton
- cllr david ireton
- cllr david jeffels
- cllr janet jefferson
- cllr anne jones
- cllr mike jordan
- cllr andrew lee
- cllr carl les
- cllr clifford lunn
- cllr don mackenzie
- cllr penny marsden
- cllr brian marshall
- cllr shelagh marshall
- cllr john McCartney
- cllr chris metcalfe
- cllr heather moorhouse
- cllr patrick mulligan
- cllr robert packham
- cllr stuart parsons
- cllr caroline patmore
- cllr chris pearson
- cllr joe plant
- cllr anthony randerson
- cllr john ritchie
- cllr janet sanderson
- cllr john savage
- cllr steven shaw-wright
- cllr elizabeth shields
- cllr david simister
- cllr andy solloway
- cllr peter sowray
- cllr tim swales
- cllr helen swiers
- cllr cliff trotter
- cllr john weighell
- cllr robert windass
- cllr richard welch
- cllr clare wood
- Horton in Ribblesdale Parish Council
- Ripon Town Council
- Thrintoft Parish Meeting
- Westow Parish Council
- Ingleton Parish Council
- Langcliffe Parish Council
- Aiskew Parish Council
- Aislaby (Scarborough) Parish Council
- Allerston & Wilton Parish Council
- Kirk Hammerton Parish Council
- Amotherby Parish Council
- Cridling Stubbs Parish Council
- Nawton Parish Council
- Asenby Parish Council
- Azerley, Winksley, Mickley & Galphay Parish Council
- Bagby & Balk Parish Council
- Barlby (part) Parish Council
- Kirkby Malham Parish Meeting
- Coniston Cold Parish Council
- Bellerby Parish Council
- Birstwith Parish Council
- Bewerley Parish Council
- Biggin Parish Council
- Burton in Lonsdale Parish Council
- Bilton-in-Ainsty with Bickerton Parish Council
- Bishop Monkton Parish Council
- Ribble Banks Parish Council
- Bolton on Swale Parish Meeting
- Brompton-on-Swale Parish Council
- Brafferton Parish Council
- Brotherton Parish Council
- Brough with St Giles Parish Meeting
- Great & Little Broughton Parish Council
- Settrington Parish Council
- Bishop Thornton & Warsill Parish Council
- Buckden Parish Council
- Burneston, Swainby-w-Allerthorpe & Theakston Parish Council

- Carlton Miniott Parish Council
- Carlton Town Parish Council
- Scampston Parish Council
- Eggborough Parish Council
- Catterick Parish Council
- Spaunton Parish Meeting
- Cayton Parish Council
- Folkton Parish Council
- Kirby Hill Parish Meeting
- Bedale Town Council
- Skipton Town Council
- Fadmoor Parish Meeting
- Knayton-with-Brawith Parish Council
- Acklam with Barthorpe Parish Meeting
- Middleton Tyas Parish Council
- Sutton-in-Craven Parish Council
- Wykeham Parish Council
- Burniston Parish Council
- Claxton & Sand Hutton Parish Council
- Cloughton Parish Council
- Darley and Menwith Parish Council
- Easingwold Town Council
- Escrick Parish Council
- Glaisdale Parish Council
- Great Ouseburn Parish Council
- Green Hammerton Parish Council
- Hackness & Harwood Dale/Broxha cum Troutsdale/Dancombe cum Langdale End/Silpho & Suffield cum Everley Parish Council
- Hunmanby Parish Council
- Kettlewell-with-Starbotton Parish Council
- Lythe Parish Council
- Malton Town Council
- Newby & Scalby Parish Council
- Bradley's Both Parish Council
- Pateley Bridge & High & Low Bishopside Town Council
- Riccall Parish Council
- Scotton (Boroughbridge) Parish Council
- Sherburn-in-Elmet Parish Council
- Sicklinghall Parish Council
- Sowerby Parish Council
- Staintondale Parish Council
- Sutton-under-Whitestonecliffe Parish Council
- Tadcaster Town Council
- Thirsk Town Council
- Thornton-in-Craven Parish Council
- Grimston, Kirby Wharfe-w-North Milford & Towton Parish Council
- Burton Leonard Parish Council
- Kirby Hall, Little Ouseburn & Thorpe Underwood Parish Council
- Luttons Parish Council
- Stutton with Hazlewood Parish Council
- Thornton-le-Beans & Crosby with Cotcliffe Parish Council
- Killerby Parish Council
- Little Langton Parish Council
- North Otterington Parish Council
- Whitwell Parish Council
- Firby Parish Meeting
- Howe Parish Meeting
- Gatenby Parish Council
- Hood Grange Parish Council
- Leake Parish Council
- North Kilvington Parish Council
- Deighton (Hambleton) Parish Council
- Hutton Bonville Parish Council
- South Cowton Parish Council
- Colburn Town Council
- Barton Parish Council
- Stapleton & Cleasby Parish Council
- Cononley Parish Council
- Dalton-on-Tees Parish Council
- Airton Parish Meeting
- Thruscross Parish Meeting
- Allerton Mauleverer-with-Hopperton Parish Meeting
- Hetton Parish Meeting
- Whorlton Parish Council
- East Harlsey Parish Council
- Melbecks (Gunnerside, Low Row) Parish Council
- Easby (Catterick Bridge) Parish Meeting
- East Ayton Parish Council
- Eastfield Town Council
- Ainderby Mires-w-Holtby & Hackforth Parish Council
- Egton Parish Council
- Exelby, Leeming & Newton Parish Council

- Muker Parish Council
- Thornton-on-the-Hill Parish Meeting
- Eppleby Parish Council
- Eskdaleside-cum-Ugglebarnby Parish Council
- Brompton by Sawdon Parish Council
- Broughton (Airedale) Parish Meeting
- Fearby, Healy Colsterdale, Ellingstring & Ilton-cum-Pott Parish Council
- Foston, Kexby & Thornton-le-Clay Parish Council
- Gate Helmsley & Upper Helmsley Parish Council
- Huby Parish Council
- Hornby Parish Meeting
- Flaxton Parish Council
- Follifoot & Plompton Parish Council
- Fylingdales Parish Council
- Melmerby Parish Meeting
- Swinton Parish Council
- Gargrave Parish Council
- Gayles Parish Meeting
- Goldsborough & Flaxby Parish Council
- West Haddlesey Parish Meeting
- Aysgarth, Bishopdale, Newbiggin, Thoraby & Thornton Rust Parish Council
- Bainbridge Parish Council
- Carperby-cum-Thoresby Parish Council
- Castle Bolton with East & West Bolton Parish Meeting
- Grantley, Sawley Eavestone & Skelding Parish Council
- Grinton & Ellerton Abbey Parish Council
- Gristhorpe & Leberston Parish Council
- Grosmont Parish Council
- Barkston Ash Parish Council
- Chapel Haddlesey Parish Council
- Hawes & High Abbotside Parish Council
- Easby (Great Ayton) Parish Meeting
- Heck Parish Council
- Gateforth Parish Council
- Newton upon Rawcliffe and Stape Parish Council
- Hellifield & Swinden Parish Council
- Helmsley Town Council
- Helperby Parish Council
- Hewick & Hutton Parish Council
- Hinderwell Parish Council
- Halton East Parish Meeting
- Danby Wiske & Lazenby Parish Council
- East & West Layton & Carkin Parish Council
- Reeth, Fremington & Healaugh Parish Council
- Boroughbridge Town Council
- Ingleby Greenhow Parish Council
- Irton Parish Council
- Hartlington Parish Meeting
- Old Byland & Scawton Parish Meeting
- Appleton Roebuck & Acaster Selby Parish Council
- Haverah & Beckwithshaw Parish Council
- Thornton-le-Moor with Thornton-le-Street Parish Council
- Kirkby Overblow Parish Council
- Northallerton Town Council
- Kelfield Parish Council
- Stanwick St John & Carlton Parish Council
- Hambleton Parish Council
- Broughton (Hovingham) Parish Meeting
- Moulton Parish Meeting
- South Stainley-with-Cayton Parish Council
- South Kilvington Parish Council
- Carlton Parish Council
- Bolton Percy, Colton & Steeton Parish Council
- Leavening Parish Council
- East Cowton Parish Council
- Sexhow Parish Meeting
- Well Parish Council
- West Scafton Parish Meeting
- Hunton Parish Council
- Cliffe Parish Council
- Hemingbrough Parish Council
- Skipwith Parish Council
- Thorganby Parish Council
- Selby (north, south, west) Town Council
- Barugh (Great & Little) Parish Council
- Askrigg & Low Abbotside Parish Council
- Borrowby (Thirsk) Parish Council
- Newton-on-Ouse Parish Council

- Siltons, Kepwick, Landmoth-cum-Catto, Nether Siltan & Over Siltan Parish Council
- Ferrensby Parish Council
- Staveley & Copgrove Parish Council
- Carlton Husthwaite Parish Meeting
- Kirby Wiske with Newsham and Breckenbrough Parish Council
- Kirk Deighton Parish Council
- Kirk Smeaton Parish Council
- Kirkby Malzeard, Laverton & Dallowgill Parish Council
- Carlton Highdale Parish Meeting
- Langthorpe Parish Council
- Lawkland Parish Meeting
- Little Ribston Parish Council
- Appleton Wiske Parish Council
- Caldwell Parish Meeting
- Linton-on-Ouse Parish Council
- Linton Parish Council
- Littlethorpe Parish Council
- Boltby, Cowesby, Felixkirk, Kirby Knowle & Upsall Parish Council
- Lockton Parish Council
- Lower Washburn Parish Council
- Kirkby Parish Council
- Crayke Parish Council
- Little Smeaton Parish Council
- Filey Town Council
- Melmerby and Middleton Quernhow Parish Council
- Rountons (West & East Rounton) Parish Council
- Spofforth-with-Stockeld Parish Council
- Masham, Burton on Yore, Ellington High, and Low and Swinton with Wathermarske Parish Council
- Thornton Steward Parish Meeting
- Melsonby Parish Council
- Middleham Town Council
- Crathorne Parish Meeting
- Welburn (Malton) Parish Council
- Kirkby Fleetham with Fencote Parish Council
- Markington-with-Wallerthwaite Parish Council
- Newholm-cum-Dunsley Parish Council
- Newton-le-Willows Parish Council
- North Duffield Parish Council
- North Rigton Parish Council
- Norton-on-Derwent Town Council
- Dishforth Parish Council
- Burn Parish Council
- Fairburn Parish Council
- Grewelthorpe Parish Council
- Draughton Parish Council
- Huttons Ambo Parish Council
- Pannal & Burn Bridge Parish Council
- Thornthwaite-with-Padside Parish Council
- Hensall Parish Council
- Great Langton Parish Meeting
- Catton Parish Meeting
- Reighton Parish Council
- Ebberston & Yedingham Parish Council
- Marton-cum-Grafton Parish Council
- Kirkby Malhamdale (Hanlith, Kirkby Malham, Malham and Malham Moor group) Parish Council
- Stainforth Parish Council
- Carlton (Stokesley) Parish Council
- Bilsdale Midcable Parish Council
- Oxtan Parish Council
- Potto Parish Council
- Preston under Scar Parish Council
- Tunstall Parish Council
- Rainton-with-Newby Parish Council
- Clint-cum-Hamlets Parish Council
- Bilbrough Parish Council
- Hartwith-cum-Winsley Parish Council
- Cawood Parish Council
- Rocliffe & Westwick Parish Council
- Romanby Parish Council
- Scruton Parish Council
- North Deighton Parish Council
- Hutton Rudby, Rudby, Middleton & Skutterskelfe Parish Council
- Sandhutton Parish Council
- East Witton Parish Council
- Aislaby, Middleton & Wrelton Parish Council
- Harome Parish Council
- Hutton-le-Hole Parish Council

- Kirby Misperton Parish Council
- Rosedale East & West Parish Council
- Seamer & Ayton (Hambleton) Parish Council
- Overton Parish Meeting
- Sharow Parish Council
- Hebden Parish Council
- Threshfield Parish Council
- Shipton Parish Council
- Wath & Norton Conyers Parish Council
- Nidd Parish Council
- Sinnington Parish Council
- Newby with Mulwith, Givendale & Skelton Parish Council
- Great Smeaton, Hornby and Little Smeaton Parish Council
- Snainton Parish Council
- Sneaton Parish Council
- Stillington Parish Council
- Barlow Parish Council
- Manfield & Cliffe Parish Council
- Thorpe Willoughby Parish Council
- Dalton (Richmond) Parish Council
- Whashton Parish Meeting
- Patrick Brompton Parish Council
- Cattal, Hunsingore & Walshford Parish Council
- Burton-cum-Walden Parish Council
- Sutton-on-the-Forest Parish Council
- Felliscliffe Parish Council
- Harmby Parish Council
- West Tanfield Parish Council
- Appleton East & West Parish Meeting
- Snape with Thorp Parish Council
- Thirkleby High & Low with Osgodby Parish Council
- Thirlby Parish Meeting
- Thornton-in-Lonsdale Parish Council
- Warlaby Parish Meeting
- Topcliffe Parish Council
- Bentham Town Council
- Pickering Town Council
- Richmond Town Council
- Calton Parish Meeting
- Scosthop Parish Meeting
- Hutton Mulgrave & Ugthorpe Parish Council
- Lastingham Parish Meeting
- Scorton Parish Council
- Morton-on-Swale Parish Council
- Hawsker-cum-Stainsacre Parish Council
- Weaverthorpe Parish Council
- Welbury Parish Council
- West Ayton Parish Council
- West Witton Parish Council
- Wighill Parish Council
- Balne Parish Council
- Wombleton Parish Council

