National Joint Utilities Group Ltd
28 Broadway, Westminster
London
SW1H 9JX
info@njug.org.uk
020 7340 1423

9th December 2008

Kent Permit Scheme – NJUG Response

CONSULTATION RESPONSE

INFORMATION ABOUT YOU

Name	Tom Coales, National Joint Utilities Group
Address	28 Broadway, Westminster, London
Postcode	SW1H 9JX
E Mail	info@njug.org.uk
Telephone	0207 340 1423
Company Name or Organisation	National Joint Utilities Group (NJUG)

Please tick one from the list below that best describes you/your company or organisation.

	Local Government (County/District, Borough/Parish
	Utility Company
	Emergency Service
	Public Transport Operator
	Central Government
	Member of the Public

Y	Other interested party (please state) UK Trade Association representing utilities on street works issues
If you are responding on behalf of an organisation or interest group how did you obtain the views of your members? Through consultation with members.	

NJUG is pleased to provide comments on the points laid out in the Appendix of the Consultation Document, pages 3 & 4 - 'Kent Permit Scheme – Changes following Second Consultation' Document.

NJUG would like to point out that it has been difficult to comment on a number of points / clarifications as NJUG has not seen clarifications in the Revised Permit Scheme Document. NJUG would like to see this as soon as possible.

1. NJUG supports the Kent permit scheme. We would like to see an effective, robust and efficient scheme, with justifiable and workable fees.

   However the proposal outlined in Appendix Point 1 allows for one notification regime for the whole of Kent (as opposed to part Permit/Part Noticing regime), which although it may result in more clarity from an administrative point of view for Utility NRSWA noticing staff, does not mirror the original proposals. It is noted that this is a compromise, as the current EToN Technical Specification does not support Kent's requirements.

   NJUG would like to ensure that the final Scheme Document clearly states that all registerable activities (bar major works) on all minor roads (and during non-traffic sensitive conditions on traffic sensitive Cat 3 & 4 roads) will be at No Charge. It is vital that Kent County Council actively pursue the amendment of the current Technical Specification to suit its requirements via the DfT and the EToN Developers Group.

2. NJUG would like to ask if a Utility is working in a traffic sensitive street at a non-traffic sensitive time (no permit fee applicable), but overruns into traffic sensitive times, then would the Utility be liable to pay a permit charge, a section 74 charge, or an FPN?

3. NJUG agrees with this proposal.

4. NJUG requires clarification of this point, as S.11 of Version 0.3 of the Kent Permit Scheme Document has already removed this discretion.

5. NJUG agrees with this proposal.

6. NJUG agrees with this proposal.

7. NJUG believes that the decision powers regarding SEHAUC attendance is outside the remit of the KCC Permit Scheme as it is an informal committee. All works promoters working within Kent will not be represented at SEHAUC (e.g. Section 50 licence workers).

8. NJUG agrees with this proposal.

9. NJUG agrees with this proposal.

10. NJUG cannot comment on this, as NJUG has not seen the clarification of requirements. NJUG would like to know exactly what the clarifications are. NJUG members would not be able to give telephone confirmation of commencement of an immediate activity on all Traffic Sensitive Streets prior to applying for a Permit, as this would result in double handling (phone call and applying for a permit).

11. NJUG requires details of this clarification.

12. NJUG would expect the cost of parking bay suspensions to be included in the cost of the permit fee, if parking bay suspensions are to be included as a permit condition. If NJUG members have to apply for a variation as a result of this condition imposed by KCC, would there be a fee associated with this? NJUG would like confirmation of these two points.

13. NJUG is unclear as to the purpose of including the Contractor's name on the permit application and not the start of works notice.

14. NJUG agrees with this proposal.

15. NJUG seeks assurances that any mandatory additional standard conditions receive the approval of the Secretary of State, as they will become an addendum to the approved scheme.

16. NJUG assumes that the exemptions detailed in the Co-ordination Code of Practice will not require a permit.

17. NJUG agrees with this proposal.

18. Without sight of the clarification NJUG cannot make any comments.

19. NJUG considers 'public satisfaction' to be very subjective and unrealistic to measure. Public surveys do not reflect the views of the majority and can be designed to be very subjective guiding the participants to a desired conclusion by restricted questioning.

20. NJUG agrees with this proposal.

21. NJUG agrees with this proposal.