



Appendix 1

PERMIT SCHEME FORMAL CONSULTATION REPORT

Title: Proposed Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Permit Scheme (BCPPS) formal consultation responses and report
Date: 12th February 2020
Authors: Paul James Streetworks Manager, Jeff Elliott Consultant, Brighton Traffic Management Ltd

1 Introduction

The formal consultation regarding the proposed Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Permit Scheme (BCPPS) ran for a period of nine (9) weeks beginning on the 10th December 2019. The deadline for receipt of responses was on 11th February 2020.

It was stated in the consultation covering email that 'all responses received by the 11th February 2020 will be taken into consideration and, if Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council consider it to be appropriate, amendments will be made to the draft Permit Scheme.

The draft Scheme Document and accompanying covering letter was issued to 144 key stakeholder organisations and individuals, including local neighbouring Highway Authorities, Utilities, road user representative groups, current suppliers and non-government organisations. The consultation was also open to everyone via the Council's website.

A total of 3 individual comments on the proposed Permit Scheme were received by the deadline.

A list of comments received, and potential response or amendments are provided in this document.

1.1 List of Consultees who responded by the deadline

1. Virgin Media (VM)
2. Openreach (OR)
3. Morebus (MB)

4. Scottish & Southern Electricity Networks (SSEN)
5. Member of the public. (MoP)

1.2 Consultees who responded after the deadline

No responses were received after the deadline.

2 Consultation Distribution List

The full distribution list includes sensitive personal data. It included all utility companies, bus operators, taxi representatives, Highway England, NHS, Network Rail, Dorset Council, Dorset Police, Tourism representatives, relevant charity transport providers, all Cllrs, relevant Council Officers. It was open to the public and any other interested party via the Council website.

3 General Comments

Org	Suggested amendment / clarification / comment / question	Response / action / recommendation
OR	<p>Key Observation - all new permit schemes now follow January 2013 DfT Additional Advice Note. Permit Schemes focusing only on the busy part of your road network defined as strategically significant streets. Permit authorities must also encourage works promoters to work wholly outside of traffic-sensitive times by offering discounted fees.</p> <p>Your scheme covers all streets, so goes against this ethos.</p>	<p>BCP Council acknowledge and follow all advice and guidance offered but must note that the highway network of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole is of a heavily urban nature and therefore nearly all the street network can be strategically significant at times. Typical examples of this are that local traffic will always tend to avoid main distributors not just at traffic sensitive times and use streets of a lower classification. Therefore, BCP officers coordinating road space activities must take account road users' actions when fulfilling the authorities network management duty expending similar resource considering all road space booking requests hence why BCP are charging maximum fees across the network.</p>

VM	<p>Key Points regarding the Permit Scheme Consultation</p> <p>As you are aware all new permit schemes now have to follow the Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes issued October 2015. Within this document it outlines a more rigorous approach to the assessment of category 0, 1 and 2, and traffic-sensitive locations than those categorised as 3 and 4. This approach enables lower fees to be applied (or waived). Permit authorities must encourage works promoters to work wholly outside of traffic-sensitive times by offering discounted fees. By following DfT advice both the Council and works promoters will be able to focus on working together to plan those works likely to cause the most disruption, rather than a blanket approach including streets that are not traffic-sensitive.</p>	<p>BCP Council acknowledge and follow all advice and guidance offered but must note that the highway network of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole is of a heavily urban nature and therefore nearly all the street network can be strategically significant at times. Typical examples of this are that local traffic will always tend to avoid main distributors not just at traffic sensitive times and use streets of a lower classification. Therefore, BCP officers coordinating road space activities must take account road users' actions when fulfilling the authorities network management duty expending similar resource considering all road space booking requests hence why BCP are charging maximum fees across the network.</p>
----	---	---

SSEN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scheme is written in plain English and of appropriate length referencing to the appropriate guidance – thank you. • The objectives are clear and have utilities and own promoters in mind. • Suggest table 1 (10.6) is moved to an appendix • We note your proposed start date of 1st June 2020 and thank you for a FPN amnesty for this initial month. • We are disappointed you have chosen to charge on all roads and charging the maximum fees for all streets. SSEN believe that there is less co-ordination required on non- traffic sensitive streets and do not agree charging maximum fees is required. • The CBA is complicated in nature and do not agree with the expected number of reduction in works days due to the permit scheme. We actually believe works will increase with the need for great utilities and the increase in new homes being built. Car charging point applications with increase exponentially in the coming years. There is no evidence to show a reduction in the costs of congestion by £1m per year. • The fee table would be useful if included in the main scheme document as an appendix. • The BCP DfT cost matrix state your permit scheme costs to be £720K, I hope if this figure is not accurate then your annual report will show this and fees will be reduced. 	<p>Thank you for you for your comments.</p> <p>BCP Council note that the highway network of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole is of a heavily urban nature and therefore nearly all the street network can be strategically significant at times. Typical examples of this are that local traffic will always tend to avoid main distributors not just at traffic sensitive times and use streets of a lower classification. Therefore, BCP officers coordinating road space activities must take account road users' actions when fulfilling the authorities network management duty expending similar resource considering all road space booking requests hence why BCP are charging maximum fees across the network.</p> <p>Please refer any queries on the CBA model out comes to DfT who designed them for use in evaluating the effectiveness of permit schemes.</p> <p>BCP Council used the DfT cost matrix inputting operational timings and staff costings in order to ascertain the scheme costs. But you will notice that the final allowable cost/cost per permit used to calculate the total permit scheme costs are higher than the maximum allowable fees. Therefore, the actual out turn of the BCP Council permit fees will be lower than the costs shown in the DfT fees matrix. BCP Council will need to closely monitor this variance and may need to lobby DfT to increase maximum allowable fees if they do not cover the costs of running a permit scheme in Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole.</p>
------	--	---

VM	2.3.4 Virgin Media acknowledges that BCP Council recognises the local economic benefits of infrastructure projects including the roll out of Superfast Broadband within their area.	Noted
VM	2.3.5 Virgin Media acknowledge that the purpose start date of the new Permit Scheme will start on 1 st June 2020.	Noted
SSEN	2.4.1 Duplication see 2.3.2 suggest removal	Thank you for your comment
SSEN	2.5.2 Duplication see 2.5.1 – suggest rephrasing	Thank you for your comment
OR, VM	2.6.3, 9.2.5 Openreach - would like to make reference to the DfT advice (letter date 17th March 2014) indicating that only the sector agreed condition matrix (HAUC Advice Note) will be acceptable. Virgin Media would like to make reference to the DfT advice (letter date 17th March 2014) indicating that only the sector agreed condition matrix (HAUC Advice Note) will be acceptable.	Noted
SSEN	2.6.4 There are cases where works will need to be extended for genuine safety reasons eg immediate works where subsequent faults ensue and / or where other incidents do not allow the works to be completed. Incentives to complete activities and not applicable in these cases.	Noted

SSEN	<p>2.6.5</p> <p>Suggest removal as 2.6.6 confirms</p>	Thank you for your comment
BT, VM	<p>2.6.6</p> <p>Openreach are disappointed that the BCP Permit Scheme and associated fees will apply to all classification of roads. If the council chooses to apply permits to 100% of streets, contrary to advice from ministers that have resulted in reduced occupation of the highway – advanced planning, use of minimum-dig technology and shared or sequential occupation of the carriageway etc.</p> <p>Virgin Media are disappointed that BCP Council are considering that all streets that are publicly maintainable by the Authority will be included on their Permit Scheme and all chargeable.</p>	Thank you for your comments
VM	<p>2.6.7</p> <p>Virgin Media acknowledge Section 58 restrictions, and will endeavour to discuss if works need to go ahead after 21 days of completion of Section 58 works for customer connections with Highway Authority prior to work taking place.</p>	Noted thank you
SSEN	<p>2.6.8</p> <p>Suggest rephrasing to confirm HA activities will follow the permit scheme and raise compliant permits</p>	BCP Council will operate the permit scheme in accordance with the set legislation showing parity to all who need to book road space
VM	<p>3.1.3</p> <p>Virgin Media would like the word pavement user changed to footway user.</p>	Agreed, amended

VM, SSEN	<p>3.1.5, 3.1.6</p> <p>Virgin Media agrees with the key factors highlighted regarding better planning, scheduling and management of activities to minimise disruption to any road user or pavement user. Virgin Media agrees that an overall drive to further improve the timing and duration of works to minimise disruption, where safe and practical to do so is a good thing however believe the current co-ordination process allows for this without the need for a permit scheme. Virgin Media already promote improvements to timing and duration of works and there are many examples of innovation in working practices that have resulted in reduced occupation of the highway – advanced planning, use of minimum-dig technology and shared or sequential occupation of the carriageway etc.</p> <p>We applaud this statement, We are happy to work together with you on this objective</p> <p>There is no evidence that can prove this statement with the introduction of a permit scheme. Works will not reduce in number and there is evidence that new homes will require even greater numbers of activities to provide essential services.</p> <p>How will this be achieved?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments</p> <p>BCP Council would refer SSEN to discuss their concerns further with DfT who have carried out investigation in to the benefits of permit schemes and published their results on the .gov web site.</p> <p>The extra resources afforded BCP Council through operating a permit scheme will improve many functions of the coordination process including dialogue</p>
SSEN	<p>5.2.1</p> <p>Suggest adding permit fees</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment</p>

SSEN	<p>5.2.2</p> <p>We welcome this</p>	Thank you for your comment
VM, SSEN	<p>6.2.2</p> <p>Virgin Media acknowledge that when lifting or replacing manhole or chamber covers Virgin Media do not need to apply for a Permit. This will speed up fault finding and survey work on the Highway Network.</p> <p>Unless in a TS street at a TS time!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment</p> <p>Noted, thank you</p>
SSEN	<p>7.2.4</p> <p>Please confirm discount available</p>	See 16.2.3 in the Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Permit Scheme document
VM	<p>7.3.1</p> <p>Virgin Media believe that an application for works may have more than one street in the scheme, especially in the case of major works.</p>	Noted
VM, SSEN	<p>7.3.3</p> <p>Virgin Media believe that this may not always be possible with regard to immediate works.</p> <p>Not necessarily, a TTRO will require a PAA but may not involve excavation eg over headwork works</p>	Noted

OR, SSEN	<p>7.5.1</p> <p>Where works have been delayed due to 3rd party damage or another incident it should not be wholly down to the promotor to notify the authority when then authority may be the cause of the delay. In the case of a major incident the authority should contact the utility to agree a way forward especially where a permit may need to be revoked due to health and safety.</p> <p>Please confirm how you wish this to be actioned? Phone or electronically</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The works promoter will be best placed to make the decision on the communication method to meet the requirements of their activities and ensure compliance with regulations</p>
VM	<p>7.5.3</p> <p>Virgin Media would not be expected to pay for another Permit if Permit Authority directs Virgin Media to close down works and reinstate if no fault of the Utility.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
VM, SSEN	<p>7.6.2</p> <p>Virgin Media believe that his is not a legislative requirement under Permit Schemes</p> <p>Not sure how operating a notice system would be relevant in this case? Under street manager all works will essentially be raised as a permit but no fee will apply until the relevant permit scheme is validated. We would just submit a separate permit to the neighbouring authority.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
SSEN	<p>7.6.3</p> <p>The project reference is only entered on the initial applications</p>	<p>Noted</p>

SSEN	<p>7.7.2</p> <p>We believe a toolkit or process be implemented to ensure all collaborators know their responsibilities and who is responsible for what costs.</p>	Thank you for your comment
SSEN	<p>7.7.3</p> <p>This may not be available if the HA suggest collaborating with a 3rd party who has already booked the road space. The HA may need to provide such details after the initial application has been received.</p>	Noted
VM	<p>7.7.5</p> <p>Virgin Media acknowledges reduce fees when collaborative working</p>	Thank you for your comment
SSEN	<p>7.10.1</p> <p>We welcome this thank you. How would you like the early start (before application) to be requested?</p>	BCP Council would refer you to our earlier answer discussing the extra resources afforded through operating a permit scheme which will improve many functions of the coordination process namely in early dialogue

OR, VM, SSEN	<p>7.10.2 You can apply for an early start on a PA. There is no requirement to submit a variation if agreed in advance.</p> <p>Virgin Media would like clarification regarding this paragraph as you can apply for an early start on a PA, but there is no requirement to submit a variation if agreed in advance.</p> <p>If the permit has not yet been applied for this will not be required as the permit will be applied for with the early start dates as agreed. This negates the need for a variation and an additional charge to the permit.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>A variation is only necessary when a previously submitted PAA or permit has been granted.</p>
OR	<p>7.11.3 This is not a requirement of a permit application and is not mandatory. An early start can be requested prior to the PAA or PA being submitted with the agreed dates.</p>	<p>There is no paragraph 7.11.3 in the BCP permit scheme document</p>
VM	<p>7.12.2 Virgin Media believe that this should be raised as unattributable works and site photographs to be issued before to sending an FPN. A FPN cannot be issued if no Permit has been raised</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments</p>
SSEN	<p>8.2.9 Please clarify this request. A PAA will only be copied on application to any parties who have contact details on the USRN.</p>	<p>BCP Council agree with your interpretation of the paragraph</p>
SSEN	<p>8.3.4 Please clarify this request</p>	<p>BCP Council agree with your interpretation of the requirement as described in 8.2.9 above</p>

SSEN	9.2.1 Has this not been changed in recent legislation?	This definition for major activities is relevant and BCP Council will follow and adhere to any approved changes in legislation
SSEN	9.2.5 Except for mandatory conditions, others should only be applied if relevant to the site and works	Agreed
SSEN	9.3.1 Should this not be Temporary TTRO not (TRO)	A <u>temporary</u> traffic regulation order (TTRO) required for road works is still classed as a traffic regulation order in legislation.
SSEN	9.3.3 Except for mandatory conditions, others should only be applied if relevant to the site and works	Agreed
SSEN	9.4.3 Except for mandatory conditions, others should only be applied if relevant to the site and works	Agreed
OR, SSEN	9.5.2 If listed as a street of early notification on the NSG we will endeavour to comply with the request providing the relevant details are shown. Usually this is defined as Early notification of works which does not specify excavation. This usually relates to any traffic management or high risk of disruption but may not involve excavation. Assume contact numbers will be on the gazetteer.	Noted Noted, agreed

SSEN	<p>9.5.3</p> <p>Suggest using retrospective application. These applications are made the following morning not within 2 hrs over night.</p>	<p>9.5.3 is discussing works within the normal day for overnight works see 9.5.4</p>
OR, SSEN	<p>9.5.5</p> <p>How do you propose we comply with this request and where is this shown in legislation?</p> <p>Please advise how you expect this to be demonstrated</p>	<p>This will be considered dependent on the activity being undertaken with full consideration of all facts at hand and communications with the works promoter.</p>
OR, VM, SSEN	<p>9.5.6</p> <p>Virgin Media would like clarification on what conditions would BCP Council place on an immediate Permit as works could of started out of hours and have been already completed when Virgin Media notify BCP Council.</p> <p>What conditions do you propose will be relevant to immediate activities bearing in mind works overnight and/or at a weekend may have started and been reinstated before the permit is raised?</p> <p>Works may have been completed before the retrospective application is submitted so this may not be applicable.</p>	<p>Works promoters should consider and apply appropriate conditions to all permit applications. BCP council will consider all applications received offering comments and requesting any changes to conditions applied that will benefit highway users and the network management duty.</p> <p>Noted</p>
SSEN	<p>10.1.2</p> <p>Should this be PAA or permit</p>	<p>Agreed, amended</p>

SSEN	10.1.6 Permit modification request PMR	Agreed, amended
SSEN	10.2.1 A practical alternative would be an Emailed form as obtaining a paper copy may not be feasible.	Noted, thank you
SSEN	10.4.1 This is purely dependant on the NSG ASD and we have not control over to whom the details are electronically sent to.	Noted
SSEN	10.4.2 Please clarify how we would be advised or know of this?	Promoters need to carry out all reasonable checks prior to undertaking their works and it is for undertaker to ensure they are meeting their requirements
SSEN	10.5.1 Suggest this is detailed to ensure compliance or added as an appendix if relevant	Promoters need to carry out all reasonable checks prior to undertaking their works and it is for undertaker to ensure they are meeting their requirements
SSEN	10.7.1 Permit modification request (PMR)	Agreed, amended

SSEN	10.7.2 Permit modification request (PMR)	Agreed, amended
SSEN	10.8.1 Please clarify how this consent will be requested? We have authority to install a new supply after 20 days but it's the reinstatement that should be discussed and agreed where a S 58 or 58A is in place.	Noted, agreed
SSEN	10.9.3 If the permit has not been granted then a modification can be applied electronically without the need for any agreement including a name. Any modification does not require an agreement and name under the permit scheme however it is good practise to discuss any changes which are fundamental from the initial application eg traffic management after the permit has been submitted and granted.	Agreed
SSEN	12.1.4 This is not mandatory or practical	BCP Council do not agree as those undertaking the works should have details with them on site of the activities being undertaken to ensure they are supporting BCP Council in meeting their network management duty
OR, VM	12.2, 12.2.1 Virgin Media acknowledge that BCP Council will be using Nationally agreed Conditions amended in 2015 Statutory Guidance. Openreach Ltd acknowledges that BCP will be adopting solely the nationally agreed conditions text developed and approved by HAUC (England) as your standard conditions.	Thank you for your comments

SSEN	<p>12.3.1</p> <p>As a street of early notification of works</p>	Correct
SSEN	<p>12.3.2</p> <p>Within 2 hrs of the start of the next working day if out of hours. Applications are not always made over night</p>	Agreed 12.3.2 notes this
VM, SSEN	<p>12.3.3</p> <p>Virgin Media would like clarification on how this would reflect the Permit as works may already be complete before applying for a Permit.</p> <p>Under the guidance all immediate works should be granted and then an AIV sent if relevant bearing in mind the works may have been completed prior to the permit application being submitted.</p>	<p>On the rare occasion that the works are completed before applying for a permit BCP Council acknowledge that it will be unlikely that the application of additional conditions will be of value to those undertaking the immediate works but any subsequent works to the same location would be expected to consider and follow reasonably requested conditions.</p> <p>Noted, agreed</p>
VM, SSEN	<p>12.4.1</p> <p>Virgin Media believe that a permit should only be revoked for significant safety breaches or in the event of an incident beyond Virgin Media control.</p> <p>Only in the case of safety or an incident beyond your control.</p>	Noted. BCP council appreciate and acknowledge the severity of revoking a permit and would only do so for clearly offered reasons specific to the Utility and activity being undertaken.

SSEN	13.2.2 Permits will still be applied for in working days and any non TS permits will only refer to working days.	Noted
SSEN	14.1.1 A granted permit should only be revoked in the case of an emergency or due to a serious safety breach.	BCP council appreciate and acknowledge the severity of revoking a permit and would only do so for clearly offered reasons specific to the Utility and activity being undertaken
SSEN	14.1.3 Please clarify the process, telephone would be preferred.	BCP Council would refer you to our earlier answers discussing the extra resources afforded through operating a permit scheme which will improve many functions of the coordination process namely in dialogue
SSEN	14.2.2 Unless due to circumstances beyond the control of the statutory undertaker	Thank you for your comment
SSEN	14.8.2 The authority should submit an AIV to the promotor	Thank you for your comment
SSEN	14.9.1 Only a works data variation or duration variation may be submitted once works have commenced.	Thank you for your comment

SSEN	<p>14.9.2</p> <p>We can apply for a duration variation if within 2 days or 20% of the duration available on the permit without need for discussion.</p>	BCP Council would refer you to our earlier answers discussing the extra resources afforded through operating a permit scheme which will improve many functions of the coordination process namely in dialogue
SSEN	<p>14.10.2</p> <p>Or by 10am the next working day.</p>	Agreed, amended
SSEN	<p>14.12.1</p> <p>Only for severe safety breaches of an incident beyond their control</p>	BCP council appreciate and acknowledge the severity of revoking a permit and would only do so for clearly offered reasons specific to the Utility and activity being undertaken
SSEN	<p>14.13.1</p> <p>The site will need to be reinstated and made safe. This will have to continue passed the time the permit has been revoked. An agreed course of action to make the site safe and return to full use will need to be agreed.</p>	Noted
SSEN	<p>16.1.1.i</p> <p>Not where a subsequent permit is refused and not used.</p>	Agreed
VM	<p>16.2.3, 16.3</p> <p>Virgin Media acknowledge the lower fees and discount of 30%.</p>	Thank you for your comment

SSEN	<p>16.3.1</p> <p>Please clarify how this will be applied</p>	BCP Council will consider all applications received on their individual merits applying discounts in accordance with the Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Permit Scheme
VM	<p>16.5</p> <p>Virgin Media acknowledge the BCP Council review of fees.</p>	Thank you for your comment
OR, VM, SSEN	<p>16.7.1</p> <p>The proven process is to issue a draft invoice electronically a month in arrears. This is checked and agreed and sent back to you within 10 working days. An invoice can then be raised. An invoice should not be levied without prior consent of the agreed charges by the utility</p> <p>Common practice is that draft invoices get raised usually a month in arrears, sent to Promotor for clarification, and then final invoice raised on agreed charges.</p> <p>The agreed practice is to submit a draft copy of proposed fees monthly in arrears. An e-mail agreeing to charges should be sent within 10 working days then an invoice can be raised.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>BCP Council will put in place mutually agreed invoicing process and timelines with all Utility's</p>
VM	<p>17.2.4</p> <p>Virgin Media would like clarification of what other offences this would be.</p>	Please refer to the NRSWA legislation for a full list of relevant offences.

VM, SSEN	<p>18.1, 18.2</p> <p>Virgin Media acknowledges that any dispute of a Permit should be resolved locally as works cannot be delayed, due to waiting for dispute review from SWHAUC or HAUC England as most work is customer led and time scales to be met.</p> <p>We welcome this</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and as referenced in the BCP permit scheme document we will endeavor to resolve disputes locally.</p> <p>If disputes are not resolved informally within 14 days, they will be referred to SWHAUC or HAUC England as appropriate.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
VM	<p>20.1.7</p> <p>Virgin Media acknowledges the issue of Fixed Penalty Notices will be suspended for the first month of operation of the new scheme.</p> <p>We welcome this</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
OR	<p>Reference to the 'Code of Practice for Permits' need removing from this scheme. This document has been withdrawn by the DFT and has been partially replaced by both Statutory Guidance and the HAUC England Guidance on the Operation of a Permit Scheme.</p>	<p>Agreed, amended</p>
OR, VM	<p>Openreach Ltd welcome the staggered introduction of the scheme with the initial month's amnesty of FPN's and would welcome the same on permit fees</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

OR	We would welcome any re-think on charging for all roads on your network as one of the permit scheme ethos is to improve the vehicle movement on the SSS highways.	Please see response to your earlier key observation
VM	Virgin Media are disappointed that BCP Council are charging maximum fees on all roads within their Proposed Permit Scheme, but would prefer an option of no charges on category 3 and 4 roads within the scheme.	Please see response to your earlier key points
VM	Will BCP Council be running shadow Permits and FPN's on their own works?	BCP Council will apply parity in application of the permit scheme regulations to all those who apply for road space through the BCP permit scheme.

MB	<p>We understand that income generated through the scheme has to be put back into the affected areas. We understand there will be administration costs associated with the scheme but would additionally request consideration of the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Income to be invested in additional control room staff to monitor CCTV cameras and make positive changes to traffic flow through traffic light phasing amendments and messages on VMS signs - particularly out of hours and when special events take place at weekends. • A holistic approach taken to backfilling. If an organisation renting a lane for permitted works is to refill a trench, consider the surface of the adjacent roadway and when appropriate, look to widen the surface area to prevent multiple sunken repairs causing uneven road surfaces in years to come <p>Overall, we welcome the scheme which we feel will encourage responsible road disruption and assist in combating traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. BCP Council will invest all in fulfilling our Network Management Duty</p>
MoP	<p>Often when road works or developments are going on areas of pavement get shut and the alternatives for pedestrians can be very inconvenient, resulting in people walking in the road unsafely rather than crossing for example. The consultation looks quite technical but is this an opportunity to address the issue and require better temporary provision while works are going on – eg use jersey barriers to create a protected pedestrian route, narrowing the carriageway on the same side? And also limiting / minimising the length of the disruption to pedestrians. This would be in line with the Councils aims to prioritise walking and reduce emissions.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Permit Scheme will address all your concerns.</p>
MoP	<p>Hello Perhaps you could let us the residents know when they are going to disrupt our roads, at the moment it is causing a great deal of frustration as so many of our roads are being dug up and then left for weeks at a time with those stupid barriers around the holes which usually get knocked over into the road and trying to drive around them is a nightmare. Whatever is going on at the moment surely does not need every road being dug up? For that is what is happening now so perhaps you had better think again on how to control things for nothing is working at the moment. So which utility company needs to dig up all the roads at the same time?? And then leave them for a couple of weeks or so? A very annoyed resident</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Permit Scheme will address all your concerns and will also help with future co-ordination.</p>

MoP	<p>The scheme is obviously sensible in stopping the clash of several roadworks at the same time or one company digging up the road immediately after one has finished - which happens often.</p> <p>But I hope you are making sure there is sufficient provision for emergency works such as the repair of water leaks and gas leaks to be attended to immediately without having to wait for office hours and a permit.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Permit Scheme makes full provision for any emergency works.</p>
MoP	<p>Brilliant idea.</p> <p>This should co-ordinate work as opposed to two or more works on the same patch of road within short time scales resulting in un-necessary road closures.</p> <p>However, regarding road works undertaken by utility companies. I feel that there should be a timescale of recall if work undertake falls short of the standards of finish.</p> <p>Currently pot hole repairs and some road resurfacing after repairs due to wear and tear is not to standard due to cost saving measures by these companies. As a consequence, re-work is required within short time scales or the finish is left as is without these companies taken to task.</p> <p>An example of this was the 1980's laying of Broad Band Cables. View the finish on the road in Longmeadow Lane, Creekmoor as a prime example. Or the footpaths around Goldfinch Road area. Particularly bad as the Goldfinch Road development I was informed, apparently has concrete conduit at the edge of the road to take cables etc which when this work was done was not utilised.</p> <p>The finish of this work was not acceptable when done and never been addressed since.</p> <p>I hope going forward more emphasis is put on contractors to provide suitable workmanship and be recalled to correct when it is not, and that inspectors of the undertaken work are put to task when they blatantly pass substandard work.</p> <p>We, as the public pay for this work one way or another and council members and employees are the custodians in place to manage what is the finished articles and ensure they meet or exceed requirements.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Permit Scheme will address your concerns and give BCP Council more authority to tackle substandard reinstatements in the future.</p>