

APPENDIX E

As outlined in section 10.1 of the report, LJUG were consulted prior to the formulation of this report. In response to the Council's stated proposals, LJUG's two consolidated consultation responses, dated 17 August and 23 September 2015 respectively, raised a number of points and concerns, which the Council has attempted to address, as follows:

LJUG consolidated respondent: Keith O'Brien, Fixed Network Specialist, NRSWA.

Summary of LJUG Comment	WCC Officer Response
<i>LJUG would have expected a longer consultation period.</i>	It is accepted that the original deadline was tight so when LJUG expressed concern regarding this, the Council duly extended the consultation period by over a month.
<i>Legislation only allows the Council to recover costs incurred in providing the service, not drive demand via charging.</i>	This is addressed in section 8 of the report.
<i>The Council has powers to manage duration of works through the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991, TMA 2004 and the London Permit Scheme. As a result works with excessive durations are rare. Increasing charges would not drive works durations down, it would just increase costs.</i>	None of the quoted legislation permit schemes incentivise shorter durations or how work is prioritised as the cost is the same whether the works take four days or ten. It is considered that in instances concerning quick works (such as new connections) and instances where bays are booked but unoccupied, savings could be generated in some areas. The Council accepts that in some instances, such as for major works, durations cannot be shortened. For this reason the Council is prepared to treat major works separately, as outlined in paragraphs 5.3.7 and 6.5.4.
<i>Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTROs), used for the temporary prohibition or change of use of any part of the highway, is sufficient for the suspension of parking bays and where a suspension is required for works, this may be added as a stipulation to the Order and no further suspension charges should be due.</i>	Regardless of the TTRO, bays would still need to be suspended and a process would need to be followed to enable this. The hand-offs involved between Streetworks and Suspensions to achieve this could result in higher costs than each being done separately and would increase the chances of errors occurring.
<i>Each LJUG member has its own statutory powers to work and can therefore occupy the highway under these powers.</i>	Agreed. However the suspension process is a service provided by the Council (encompassing signage installation, enforcement, customer contacts, complaint handling and account management, amongst other things) and is acknowledged as being best practice, giving a greater and more formal assurance that space will be available when required. It also allows the Council to more effectively manage the kerbside.

<p><i>No more than one day should be charged for, as the remainder of the duration will be guaranteed by occupation.</i></p>	<p>It is true that in most cases, occupation would guarantee access for the duration. However, this would not incentivise shorter durations as a single day suspension would then cost the same as a one hundred day suspension. The Council therefore refers back to its reasoning for the charging structure proposals as outlined in sections 6.2, 6.3 and 6.5 of the report.</p>
<p><i>The timing of the review is poor as LJUG's budgetary costs and considerations for the year have long since been made. Any cost for undertaking customer driven works will impact the customer. Furthermore it is the longer-term works that will be affected most by the proposals. The greater costs to these will discourage capital investment and lead to an increase in reactive works.</i></p>	<p>The concerns regarding the timing of the Council's review are noted, but whilst this is unfortunate it cannot be helped. In terms of costs, there may be potential to mitigate these to some extent by generating savings through reduced durations, where this is possible.</p>
<p><i>LJUG would like major works to be considered separately.</i></p>	<p>Agreed, as per paragraphs 5.3.7 and 6.5.4 of the report.</p>
<p><i>LJUG would like a service framework agreement which includes vehicle removal. If viewed as a separate service, LJUG request a breakdown of costs for providing that service.</i></p>	<p>The Council provides vehicle relocations as a separate service and recently extended its vehicle relocation contract from 1 July 2015. The unit costs of providing a relocation service are as follows (per relocation vehicle, per hour, min 8 hrs):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peak hours' daily rate Mon-Sat (07:30 to 15:30) - £52.50. • Off-peak call-off Mon-Sat (15:30 to 07:30) - £55.00. • Off-peak call-off dedicated Sunday service - £57.00. • Off-peak call-off dedicated bank/public holiday service - £71.00.
<p><i>LJUG would prefer a rate of £45 that covers the first three days of a suspension, with incremental charge increases only occurring from day four, or the scheme remaining as is with a percentage increase on the flat-rate charge.</i></p>	<p>The Council has proposed three scenarios in the report for LJUG charging, with scenario three being a flat-rate for the first three days of a suspension, albeit at £70. The reasons for proposing an increase in charging is outlined in section 6 of the report. In view of LJUG's comments, Officer recommendation in the report for LJUG-related charges is for scenario three.</p>
<p><i>LJUG would like to agree a process to formalise the refunding of charges for circumstances where the service will not or cannot be used.</i></p>	<p>The Council is happy to formulate a process for agreement. This will be done under separate cover.</p>