

Yorkshire Common Permit Scheme - Frequently Asked Questions		
Q. No.	Question/Issue	YPSB Reply
1	Do you pay higher permit charge if variations change to higher category from minor to standard for example?	<i>If a permit variation moves an activity into a higher fee category, the promoter will be required to pay the difference in permit fee as well as the permit variation fee. (YCPS, 11.3)</i>
2	Was when PAA payment applicable solved is? Is it payable on receipt of permit application and most include on monthly charge?	<i>Once a permit application or PAA has been approved (other than by default) the appropriate fee will be payable, even if the activity is subsequently cancelled by the promoter. However, until this national issue is resolved through the National Permits Forum/Legal advice, the PAA will become payable on receipt of the corresponding PA. Charges will be sent monthly, not necessarily linked together on the same invoice.</i>
3	How do operatives see conditions on site, do they get printed packs and see the codes MC1? Free text?	<i>Varies between works promoters. See also the reply to Q.4 about the development of model conditions.</i>
4	Were local conditions agreed upfront before permit scheme came in place?	<i>The YCPS contains two local condition types. These are shown as "Supplementary Conditions" in section 7.4.7. A list of model conditions relating to all the condition types specified in the Scheme document is being developed.</i>
5	If a permit was refused as we had to add a condition? If we meet that condition and resend, do the original dates still stand or do we have to send early start in which case is that a variation?	<i>It would depend on the activity type, so would likely be more of an issue with Minor activities. Early start arrangements to be discussed.</i>
6	What happens if you finish early on agreed date in TM situations? YPS want to know as it could be 24 hours before we send the notice as site clear? Would we send a comment?	<i>A model condition will be included where the permit authority wants to know immediately about an "early finish", so that the promoter contacts the authority [by phone or comment]. A works stop notice should also be served within the appropriate timescale.</i>
7	If application states 2 way lights and the actual on site risk assessment requires no lights.... is a variation sent and this is at no cost as less disruption caused?	<i>In the case of a promoter-initiated change to the agreed conditions - YCPS, 8.2.1 - the variation would need to be agreed by the authority and would be chargeable at the discretion of the authority, depending on the circumstances</i>
8	Option 1) A permit application has been agreed (could have had a previous PAA, it doesn't matter in this scenario). We can't maintain the dates and so request a variation for the date change which is then agreed. Say its a Developer Site and there is a further delay (or delays) which mean we keep requesting variations for date changes into the future. Q = is it acceptable to roll on dates in this way using a date variation, how many times (is there a limit?)	<i>YCPS, 8.2.4 (penultimate paragraph) covers this, i.e. there would need to be discussion between the promoter and authority to ensure that a further variation could be granted.</i>
9	Option 2) Following on from the scenario above, if the works are then cancelled because the Developer can't commit a date. Assume this would be a new application and if so would it need the same works reference so you can see the entire history (or can it start again separately). Q = when does option 1 become option 2?	<i>The YCPS requires notifications via EToN and complying with the Tech. Spec. In the Tech. Spec, 3.11.4 covers cancellations - if it is the first phase that is cancelled, the works reference cannot be re-used.</i>
10	The issue of finishing early and whether we need a variation to reset the dates . Did we come to a conclusion on this? Was this just for works with TM or anything?	<i>Please see the reply to Q.6</i>
11	Extensions for works with 1 day duration (trailer team type of activities). If there are unforeseen difficulties on site, how can we extend this given the 20% or 2 day rule?	<i>YCPS, 8.2.4 (second bullet point) - which covers situations where there is less than 20% or 2 days.</i>

Q. No.	Question/Issue	YPSB Reply
12	<p>Planned Works (not Immediate)</p> <p>1) Works on site, team has excavated and in doing so they need to do something not covered by the agreement (such as works in footway then we need to out to carriageway) which means we cant meet the conditions. Could be that we need TM or not, or encroaching into c/way with walkway but with no TM implications. Do we:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) ring while on site for a Variation</li> <li>b) pull the team off site but not site clear and request a Variation through system. If we are waiting for the response 2 days it could mean we need to extend the end date too. If we build in the time response for the variation should we go for the extension automatically in addition to the primary condition changes, or ask for a 2nd variation for the extensions of the end date on receipt of the agreement of the first variation for the primary changes?</li> <li>c) continue with works on site, submit a Variation through system and keep fingers crossed? - technically we would be in breach of agreed conditions</li> <li>d) abort works, backfill, reinstate and clear site...This option carries regulatory risk for Utilities as well as Customer issues. This option is in no ones best interest!</li> </ul> <p>Immediate works would be exactly the same except no option (d) as we would not be able to abort works but in this case surely this would be a phone call in addition to the variation being submitted through system</p> <p>Dare I say it but do we need to define the circumstances and produce another matrix?</p>	<p><i>This will need an agreed process.</i></p>
13	<p>Changes to TM (downgrading) when on site, such as lights proposed and agreed as part of PA but then risk assessed and not needed when on site so not used. Is this simply a variation through system and carry on? Anita has already picked this up but have we reached a conclusion on this? Again we need to think carefully about this in order to drive the right behaviours...this is about minimising disruption after all?</p>	<p><i>Please see the reply to Q.7</i></p>
14	<p>Agreed PA (could have had a previous PAA but not relevant) with two types of TM within the duration of the works (John L touched on this). On the permit application presume the free text would include words to cover the two types but which type (such as lights then a road closure) do we specify as being used in EToN (when we select the TM type)? Is it the most impacting? We shouldn't need a variation because the detail is within the free text and you would have agreed the application on this basis? John also said something about a confirmation phone call 24 hours before the planned TM change. Is this right? Please can we clarify the above?</p>	<p><i>YCPS, 7.4.3, covers situations where separate TM conditions are agreed in the permit. Would this then be a Works Data Variation (YCPS, 6.11), to keep the Permit Register correct, at no charge to the promoter - because the changes have already been agreed.</i></p>
15	<p>I know we discussed training awareness. My technical guys have asked if there is scope for a highway / utility workshop to go through scenarios to include them which they feel will be useful on both sides?</p>	<p><i>Workshops have been discussed at YPOG</i></p>
16	<p>How will authorities deal with Christmas/New Year restriction under the permit scheme. To be discussed by authorities at the Strategic Board.</p>	<p><i>The impact of proposed activities would be assessed as part of the permit approval process. Where required, the authority could then send an authority-initiated variation (YCPS, 8.3)</i></p>
17	<p>Regarding immediate works, in most instances I'm guessing we won't have received the permit response / reference by the time the task team has COM'ed the order. However we are in theory in breach of failing to display the permit ref if we wait until the backfill resource visits site to update the board. We would therefore need a new process to dispatch a support technician to site to update the board upon receiving the permit update (time, cost, fuel usage!!). The same scenario would also need to occur should we request a variation which is subsequently approved by the permit authority.</p>	<p><i>Permit regulations require the permit reference number to be displayed on the site information board, and so activity promoters will need to comply with this requirement. With regard to updating the permit reference, works promoters are required to check their sites frequently and it should not be burdensome to have the permit suffix updated at the same time. It will be acceptable for the works promoter to display (in the case of an Immediate permit) or update (in the case of a permit variation) the permit reference on site by no later than 10 am on the next day after the permit or variation has been received by the promoter.</i></p>
18	<p>For immediate works, what reference do we display (if anything) while the Immediate Permit application is being considered, i.e. is the space on the info board left blank.....this cant be an offence because we are, during your response period, doing nothing wrong???</p>	<p><i>Please see the reply to Q.17</i></p>
19	<p>Do you see Section 58 approval process being part of the permit application or separate? At the moment YW follow an email approval process for S58 street works and would want to continue this, only applying for the permit (and attracting costs) if we knew the S58 was approved.</p>	<p><i>The YCPS, Appendix B sections 5.1 and 5.2 set out the activities that are exempt from a S58 restriction. Section 5.3 deals with activities where the consent of the Permit Authority is required. Promoters would need to obtain agreement from the Permit Authority prior to submitting a permit application for non-exempt works under a S58 restriction, as per Appendix B, section 5.4.</i></p>

Q. No.	Question/Issue	YPSB Reply
20	Are you going to want to see site footprint maps etc for all works, or just those under certain circumstances? "6.10.5 Illustration". Given that we don't have a usable disruption effect score, can we try and identify what additional information could be required dependant on the circumstances (another matrix)? A suggestion...(Embedded image moved to file: pic18529.gif)	<i>It would not be possible to specify in advance all the circumstances where "Illustration" information might be required. As it says in section 6.10.5, the information will be particularly important where the activity is significant in terms of potential disruption.</i>
21	SED...6.10.5 continues... Question = Is the agreement required only if the location of works is relevant to the location of the asset specified in SED	<i>The YCPS, sections 5.3.2 .1 to 5.3.2.10 set out the extent to which a SED designation applies to specific types of engineering difficulty, e.g. for bridges the designation applies to the whole of the bridge and adjacent areas.</i>
22	P45 7.4.3 Traffic management – talks about HA imposing TM conditions hopefully with agreement. What if utility does not agree. Any instruction in relation to TM where CDM regs apply, make the HA Engineer to the scheme therefore accountable for the works aswell.	In the event that agreement cannot be reached, the YCPS sets out in section 10 the dispute resolution procedure. See section 10.2 in particular.
23	We do need more clarification as to when illustrations are required. To simplify, for any Major / Standard works / TM jobs for example??	This was covered in the reply to Q. 20. The reply was: <i>It would not be possible to specify in advance all the circumstances where "Illustration" information might be required. As it says in section 6.10.5, the information will be particularly important where the activity is significant in terms of potential disruption.</i>
24	If we identify a couple of activities such as stop tap repairs, not linked but is in one USRN, by communication we could do under one permit? Or link to get discount?	YCPS, 6.12 sets out that <i>"One permit can only contain one phase of an activity... Phased activities must relate to the same works."</i> YCPS, 6.12.2 says <i>"Linked activities carried out at separate locations in a street must be treated as belonging to the same set of works. However, unconnected activities carried out by the same promoter in one street must not be treated as parts, or phases, of a single set of works."</i> The application of these sections can be covered in scenario testing before the Permit Scheme goes live.
25	If a site has been cleared other than leaving an excavation temporarily plated over, would there still need to be a site information board on site displaying the permit reference?	Yes, the permit reference would need to be displayed on site.
26	If a major works is required at short notice (i.e. <3 months) but is not considered immediate, how do we expedite the permit process? Do we apply for PAA, PA and an Early Start variation?	An "early start" process has been circulated at YPOG. Once agreed, it will become a YCPS Advice Note.
27	If on last day of a permit, a repair fails again (e.g. repaired leak burst again), do we: • Raise variation and potentially accept FPN for no Permit and Overrun • Raise a new PA and an Early Start variation • Send a works stop and start a new immediate works	In this situation, where the repair fails before the excavation is reinstated, the promoter should apply for a variation to their current permit to revise the duration - see YCPS, 8.2.4 (second bullet point). Promoters should note that although permit authorities may agree to extend the duration of the permit, they might not agree to extend the reasonable period - see YCPS, 12.8 - in which case they would be subject to the S74 overrun charging regime.
28	If we have 2 difference unconnected jobs in same USRN (e.g. 2 stop tap repairs at separate addresses), do we: *Raise 1 permit *Raise 2 linked permits *Raise 2 separate permits *Or, is this not allowed as permit is for 1 job on whole USRN?	Please see the reply to Q.24.
29	Where a number of manholes required repairs, is a separate permit required for each one; even if within .5m of each other?	Please see the reply to Q.24.
30	If a permit condition stipulated that environmental and arbocultural consultation is required before the permit is granted – who is responsible for this; STW or the Highway Authority?	The Permit Authority will be involved, and will also facilitate discussion between the promoter and the environmental/arbocultural department.

Q. No.	Question/Issue	YPSB Reply
31	If need to place an advanced warning sign in a different street and we raise a permit request for this; do we need to also have a courtesy board with reference numbers?	In this circumstances, where no excavation is taking place in the "different street" then it would not be a registerable activity, and so no permit would be required.
32	Is it possible to provide examples of the illustrations required for each of the 4 work types?	To be considered. YPSB will be looking at some examples of illustrations currently being used.
33	We issue an pa or a paa. It needs tweaking following conversations with the Permit Authority. Question: How will we know this, will you be rejecting the pa/paa or will it be a comment. Is there a detrimental affect on KPI as a result of the rejections status.	In this circumstance, where conversation is taking place between the promoter and permit authority, communication is likely to be by comment or phone call, and a permit would be refused only if it was getting to the end of the response time. There is a KPI for refused permits.
34	We issue a modified application (dates remain unchanged). Questions: (i) if the modified application cant be processed within the response time of the original pa/paa our original planned date is at risk. Did we say that as best practice we should look to amend the start date on the modified application to remove the risk? (ii) Does the original pa/paa have to be rejected (to prevent it from being deemed) or is it superseded by the modified application?	(i) Yes, good practice would be to amend the start date. (ii) YPSB suggest that this could be examined in scenario testing to see how different systems handle this.
35	Do you expect us to list the model conditions on the PAA, if so how do we know which ones you expect?	PAAs should contain a reasonable outline of the proposed works and how they are likely to be carried out. Some details might not be available at the outset but promoters should include as much information as possible regarding conditions. Where significantly different or amended conditions not included in the PAA are included subsequently in a PA, and the changes mean more of an impact on the highway network, the PA may need to be refused pending further planning or co-ordination by permit authorities.
36	Are your HA Inspectors geared up to carry out TM Site Inspections prior to us submitting the PAA (i.e. 2 weeks before your GoLive date, which is when by the way) and how do we log the call?	Yes - not necessarily an inspector but someone within the relevant permit authority would be able to carry out a site meeting regarding traffic management, subject to reasonable requests so that resources can be managed.
37	When do you expect the TM Plans to be emailed to your .box in relation to us submitting a PAA?	Although detailed traffic management information might not be available at the PAA stage, promoters should send what they have as soon as they have it available, to enable permit authorities to consider the application within the relevant response period.
38	Bearing in mind a PAA cannot be amended (EToN Tech' Spec') how do you intend to agree the conditions? If this is before the PA is sent do you intend cancelling the PAA (at no fee) and re-raising. If this cancelling & re-raising effort takes time, the 3 months advanced notice to our planned start date will have passed and result in us asking for an early start and you seeking a variation cost which we'll no doubt object to. In talking with my colleagues in London with the LoPS, all discussion regarding the PAA and conditions is by return path comments, with the final condition listing being sent with the PA.	Promoters need to ensure that they have a granted PAA before the PA is made. If, due to systems issues, this means that an early start request would need to be made then this needs to be done in the resubmitted PAA - no variation fee would apply in this circumstance. See also the answer to Q.35.
39	Planning Major Works. In order to determine routes for installation of apparatus it may be necessary to excavate trial holes prior to submitting a PAA. Can the trial hole element of the works be undertaken as Minor Activity Applications where the planned duration is three days or less.	Trial holes in advance of Major works may be notified as a "Minor" activity so long as the planned duration is a minimum of 3 days or less (YCPS, 6.8.4). The application period for minor activities is usually 3 days but longer lead-in periods may be required in certain