



Joint Secretaries
 Guy Townsend
 Fibernet
 Rosalind House,
 Jays Close
 Viables,
 Basingstoke RG22 4BS
 Tel: 01256 858580
 Fax: 01256 858601
 E-mail: gtownsend@fibernet.co.uk

Barry Lucas
 Principal Technical Officer
 Islington Council
 Fourth Floor, Laycock Wing
 222 Upper Street, London, N1 1YA
 Tel: 0207 527 2582
 Fax: 0207 527 2194
 E-Mail: barry.lucas@islington.gov.uk

Quarterly Meeting

**Held at TfL offices at Eccleston Place, London
 on the 28th October 2005.**

Attendees:

Peter Loft	Thames Water, Chairman,
Steve Barriff	Corporation of London, Joint Chairman
Guy Townsend	Fibernet, Joint Secretary
Barry Lucas	L B Islington, (North & East London), Joint Secretary
Louise Nagle	London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, (West London)
Neil Davies	Metropolitan Police
Dave Lambert	London Borough of Bromley, (South London)
Bob Bayley	Transport for London
Jim Blewett	Transport for London - Observer
Steve Leeks	EDF Energy
Roger Khanna	London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, (LoTAG)
Peter Dixon	London Borough of Croydon, (South London)
Keith O'Brien	Thus
Barry Rainger	BT
Tony Pegrum	Royal Borough of Kensington & Chelsea, (West London)
Tony Norman	Network Rail
Matt Jezzard	L B Sutton – Observer
Alan Florry	Southern Gas Networks
Harry Pendleton	HAUC UK – Utilities National Chair
Chris Tunstall	HAUC UK – Highways National Chair
Graham Eaton	NSWHG

Apologies:

Julie Ulliott	National Grid Transco
Eddy Owen	3 Valleys Water
Nigel Bennett	National Grid Transco
Mark Ostheimer	NTL

Item

2 Minutes from previous meeting

Minutes of the previous meeting held on the 29th July 2005 were read for accuracy and agreed.

Page 3, item 4. BB's report was about s74 and not TMA.

Page 3, item 5. LondonWorks has slowed due to slippage.

Page 5, item 12(4). EO has not yet contacted BB for numbers.

Jim Blewett reported the death of Albert Simon, late of London Buses Infrastructure. Our sympathy goes to his family.

Action

3 National and Regional HAUC matters

SB reported:

High Speed Roads.

As the Highways Agency has established a group to examine temporary traffic management on what they have termed 'lower speed roads', those of 50 mph or below, SB agreed to report back after further discussions with the HA. HP added that Yorkshire HAUC had done some work on the subject.

SB

Compliance Testing.

SB confirmed that he now had a copy of the report that he would circulate in due course. This delay is because there is some question about copyright, as the report is a CSS document.

Temporary ATS.

Still awaiting for legal clarification from the DfT.

Codes of Practice.

Notices:

BB confirmed that the Notice group were scheduled to meet on 12th December.

Reinstatement:

DL said that the working party would be meeting in Nottingham sometime during November. The meeting was scheduled to be held over 2 days. Any observations regarding amendments to the Code of Practice should be sent to Kevin Fuller at Hampshire CC or to DL direct. CT said that any change to the Code was unlikely until after 2007.

Training:

CT informed the meeting that this subject was low on the priorities of the DfT. The meeting expressed concern that migrant labour would not be properly accredited.

Inspections:

Sub-group were scheduled to meet on 1st November.

Diversions works:

HAUC (UK) had asked the DfT for clarification on a number of matters, but a response was not expected for some while.

HAUC (UK):

Next meeting to be held on 2nd November.

4 Traffic Management Act 2004.

Filming/Parking Waivers

SB said that he had agreed to bring this subject to this forum but the London Streetworks Group felt that this was not the appropriate place for any recommendations or decision.

PL mentioned utility works and parking etc. bay suspensions, and suggested representatives from utility companies and highway authorities should meet to discuss a practical way forward. The consensus, amongst the London Streetworks Group members, was that this was not a "StreetWorks" issue.

Network Management Duty/Notifications

KO'B asked about the lead-in time for works involving temporary traffic management orders. He said that the amount of paperwork involved, together with the requirements of TfL, indicated that the notice period would be, to customers, unreasonable. PD said that, unless the TfL processing time could be shortened, Croydon expected a lead-in time of 10 weeks.

BB said that if existing arrangements were proving problematic for utilities they should write to TfL.

5 Transport for London

LondonWorks.

There was some discussion about who should 'own' the good ideas/good practice that have been developed during the project. The London Streetworks Highways Group suggested that London HAUC would be the correct repository. It had also said that these should be reviewed on a regular basis and added to, or amended, as and when required.

TP said that the documents needed a wide circulation, for comments, and added that the working party still had much to do.

SL thought that workshops and presentations might be a good way of promoting this.

BB said that TfL would support and assist in any exposition, or possibly a London HAUC conference, which could also promote this. (Volunteers were asked for to arrange such an event).

CT asked whether the 'good practice' document could be used nationally.

BB replied that as it was a generic document there should be no difficulties in this.

6 Metropolitan Police Issues

ND has now taken the place of Jim McTiernan. The group expressed their thanks to Jim for his input over the past few years.

ND confirmed the extent of the security area around Westminster and how far it extended into other boroughs. He also confirmed that, on occasions, vehicle numbers and operatives names would be asked for when works are to be carried out within that zone. KO'B asked where that information should be sent. ND replied that the appropriate officer was Dave Redfearn at the Traffic Division based at Drummond Crescent.

7 London HAUC Emergency Plan

SB is continuing to work on the document and is checking the contents with the Corporation's Emergency Planners. It is hoped that a completed paper can be presented at the January meeting.

8 London HAUC website

BR confirmed that he was now in receipt of all relevant documentation from Andy Swift.

A meeting of the working party will be arranged for early in 2006.

9 Improvement Notices

A copy of the previous Improvement Notice Protocol is still being sought.

There was, again, discussion about the sample size for improvement notices. It was agreed that this be referred back to the inspection working party.

10 Any Other Business

PD reported that Croydon were having difficulties with Thames Water's consultant. He reported failures in attending joint inspections and disputing defects on out of date information.

BR said that his organisation often received defects some time after the original inspection. He asked that they be issued on the same day as the inspection. It was suggested that he deal with those authorities that send 'old' defects on an individual basis.

TN said that Network Rail had written asking for clarification of the definition of registerable works and notifications.

DL asked whether details of operatives and supervisors including accreditation number be entered on the defect sheet. This would create an audit trail for persistent offenders.

SL replied that, for the most part, utility companies just wouldn't have the information.

DL accepted that the transience of labour in the industry made it difficult but utility companies did have a duty of care.

RK said that there was a 60% chance of a severe winter and recommended that contingencies were prepared for this.

He also said that the Mayor was concerned about the appearance of London and reminded the meeting that worksites should be kept clean and asked that they be checked for litter on a daily basis.

RK said that there was often a conflict between works areas and refuse collection vehicles, particularly where HERAS fencing was being used. He asked that those present ask their contractors to keep work site sizes to a minimum.

SL requested that TfL host its own quarterly co-ordination meetings.

SL also brought to the attention of the meeting the subject of infill covers being used during footway reconstruction being executed by highway authorities. He said that there was often a lack of utility identifier on the box and they frequently exceeded the weights permitted under the lifting regulations.

HP, CT and CE thanked the meeting for their invitation. PL thanked them for attending and also for their input.

BTL circulated a list of the London boroughs co-ordination meetings that he had received to date.

PL asked the meeting to assist in the planning of the catering arrangements by indicating their attendance at each meeting by confirming receipt of the agenda.

11 Date of next meeting

1st February 2006. Venue tbc, commencing at 10.00 a.m.

LONDON HAUC Co-ordination meetings for 2006

Dates of Borough NRSWA '91 Co-ordination Meetings for 2006						
Borough	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter	Additional	
Barking and Dagenham	09-Mar-06	08-Jun-06	07-Sep-06	07-Dec-06		commence at 10.00 a.m.
Barnet	19-Jan-06	20-Apr-06	20-Jul-06	19-Oct-06		commence at 09.30 a.m.
Bexley	20-Jan-06	07-Apr-06	21-Jul-05	20-Oct-05		commence at 10.00 a.m.
Brent	07-Feb-06	09-May-06	08-Aug-06	07-Nov-06		commence at 10.00 a.m.
Bromley	16-Feb-06	18-May-06	17-Aug-06	16-Nov-06		commence at 10.00 a.m.
Camden	11-Jan-06	12-Apr-06	12-Jul-06	11-Oct-06		commence at 2.00 p.m.
City of London	10-Jan-06	04-Apr-06	04-Jul-06	03-Oct-06		commence at 10.00 a.m.
Croydon	26-Jan-06	27-Apr-06	27-Jul-06	26-Oct-06		commence at 10.00 a.m.
Ealing						commence at 2.00 p.m.
Enfield	07-Mar-06	06-Jun-06	05-Sep-06	05-Dec-06		commence at 10.00 a.m.
Greenwich	25-Jan-06	19-Apr-06	26-Jul-06	25-Oct-06		commence at 10.00 a.m.
Hackney	07-Feb-06	02-May-06	01-Aug-06	07-Nov-06		commence at 1.30 p.m.
Hammersmith and Fulham	22-Mar-06	14-Jun-06	13-Sep-06	13-Dec-06		commence at 10.00 a.m.
Haringey	07-Feb-06	02-May-06	01-Aug-06	07-Nov-06		commence at 10.00 a.m.
Harrow						commence at 10.00 a.m.
Havering	14-Mar-06	13-Jun-06	12-Sep-06	12-Dec-06		commence at 10.30am
Hillingdon						commence at 10.00 a.m.
Hounslow						commence at 1.00 p.m.
Islington	22-Feb-06	24-May-06	23-Aug-06	22-Nov-06		commence at 10.00 a.m.
Kensington and Chelsea	23-Feb-06	25-May-06	24-Aug-06	16-Nov-06		commence at 10.00 a.m.
Kingston	23-Mar-06	15-Jun-06	14-Sep-06	30-Nov-06		commence at 10.30 a.m.
Lambeth						
Lewisham	28-Feb-06	23-May-06	22-Aug-06	28-Nov-06		commence at 10.00 a.m.
Merton	14-Feb-05	16-May-05	08-Aug-05	07-Nov-05		commence at 10.00 a.m.
Newham	12-Jan-06	23-Mar-06	22-Jun-06	21-Sep-06		commence at 10.00 a.m.
Redbridge	08-Mar-06	07-Jun-06	06-Sep-06	06-Dec-06		commence at 10.00 a.m.
Richmond						commence at 10.00 a.m.
Southwark	15-Feb-06	17-May-06	16-Aug-06	15-Nov-06		commence at 1.00 p.m.
Sutton	21-Mar-06	13-Jun-05	12-Sep-05	12-Dec-05		commence at 10.00 am
Tower Hamlets	06-Mar-06	05-Jun-06	04-Sep-06	04-Dec-06		commence at 10.00 am
Waltham Forest	02-Mar-06	01-Jun-06	07-Sep-06	07-Dec-06		commence at 10.00am
Wandsworth	04-Jan-06	05-Apr-06	05-Jul-06	04-Oct-06		commence at 10.30am
Westminster						commence at 10.30am
HAUC (UK)	25-Jan-06	26-Apr-06	05-Jul-06	11-Oct-06		commence at 10.30am
London HAUC	01-Feb-06	03-May-06	26-Jul-06	25-Oct-06		commence at 10.00 a.m.
National Street Works Highways Group						commence at 10.30am
London Street Works Highways Group	13-Jan-06	14-Apr-06	07-Jul-06	13-Oct-06		commence at 10.00 a.m.
London Joint Utility Group						
Area Street Works Highways Group - North East	23-Feb-06	25-May-06	24-Aug-06	23-Nov-06		commence at 10.30 a.m.
Area Street Works Highways Group - West	09-Feb-06	11-May-06	10-Aug-06	09-Nov-06		commence at 10.00 am
Area Street Works Highways Group - South	15-Mar-06	14-Jun-06	13-Sep-05	13-Dec-05		
Area Street Works Highways Group - Central						
London Boroughs Pipe Subway Group		25-Apr-06		24-Oct-06		commence at 10.00 am
Dates in red are unconfirmed						

The above information is based on information received from the various authorities and is correct as of the 10th January 2006. The dates should be checked with the individual authorities prior to the meeting.



Rosaleen Hubbard
Utility-Side Secretariat
NJUG
59-60 Russell Square
London, WC1B 4HP
Tel: 0870 801 8007
Fax: 0870 801 8008
Email: info@njug.co.uk

Graham Eaton
Local Authority-Side Secretariat
C/o Derbyshire County Council
Environmental Services Dept.
County Hall, Matlock
Derbyshire DE4 3AG
Tel: 01629 760062
Email: graham.eaton@derbyshire.gov.uk

HIGHWAY AUTHORITIES & UTILITIES COMMITTEE

HIGHWAY AUTHORITIES AND UTILITIES COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE HIGHWAY AUTHORITIES AND UTILITIES COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY 13th July 2005 AT THE OFFICES OF NJUG, RUSSELL SQUARE LONDON, WC1B 4HP

PRESENT

Chris Tunstall (Chair)
Les Guest (Acting Joint Chair)
David Baker
Peter Whitehouse
Nick Powell

Lester Sonden
Mark Ostheimer
Ron Weaver
Bob Bayley
Peter Whitehouse
Steve Barriff
Paul Newman
Stephen Chandler
Barrie Davies
Chris Walker
Martin Hobbs
David Pilsworth
Kevin Fuller
David Padfield
Marc Owen
Keith O'Brien
Graham Eaton
Rosaleen Hubbard

Durham CC
NGT
TFL
Sandwell MBC
Cornwall CC Training and
Accreditation WG
WaterUK
Ntl
Telewest Broadband
NSWHG (TFL)
Duplicate name
Corp of London/London HAUC
Network Rail
Welsh Assembly Government
Welsh HAUC
East Sussex CC/CSS
Highways Agency
Highways Agency
Highways Chair – Specification W.G.
DfT
Welsh HAUC
Thus
NSWHG
NJUG Secretariat

1.

Apologies for Absence

Harry Pendleton
Peter Goode
Bill Barker
Mike Talbot
Fiona Sakwa
Steven Hennah

Cable & Wireless (Joint Chair)
Nottingham City Council / NSWHG
Highway-side Chair, RAUC(S)
DfT
DfT
Welsh HAUC

Phil Burnett
Alan Rainford
Malcolm Taylor
Louise Green
Dave Turnbull
Findlay Taylor
Neale Walshe

HAUC (UK) Training and Accreditation WG
Ntl/Specification Working Group
NIE
Road Services Northern Ireland
BT
RAUC Scotland (Utilities Side)
Telewest Broadband

2. Notes of the Meeting on 20th April 2005

05.37 The minutes were approved.

3. Matters Arising

05.38 0534 High Speed Roads. A meeting, to discuss the impact on utilities of the new high speed road designations, is to be arranged between HSE and NJUG. A group, under the auspices of the Highways Agency, has been set up and is being lead by Ginny Clark. RH to contact. The DfT had not yet raised the subject of High Speed Roads with the Road Liaison Group as requested at the April HAUC(UK) meeting

05.39 05.31 Chris Walker gave a verbal report on the CSS project on compliance testing. The report is at the final draft stage and is likely to be published in the near future The group had representatives from highways authorities and one from NJUG. As part of the project, TRL were commissioned to undertake a study on reinstatement compliance monitoring across the UK. A programme of monitoring of coring has been running in Scotland since 1997 and information from this exercise was used as part of the project.

One of the key findings of the report is that whilst coring provides data on the compliance of bound layers it does not address unbound layers which relate directly to long term life (compaction). There is no agreed methodology for testing unbound layers. More research into the testing of the unbound layers is required. There are a number of methods used for the detailed monitoring of the unbound layers of reinstatements, but no one method is used consistently across the UK

The RAUC(S) coring project, now in its fifth programme, is showing signs of progress in reinstatement quality. One of the key areas is having an agreed process that all parties work to. Road authorities, Undertakers and Contractors are all engaged in the process and the annual results are reported to the Scottish Executive and Chief Executives of all of the bodies involved in RAUC (S).

The estimated costs of a national coring programme would be

£2.6 to £3.9 million per annum. The report includes a cost to benefit ratio of 3 or 4 to 1 in favour of compliance testing.

The CSS Project Conclusions and Recommendations include:

- There should be a national reinstatement compliance monitoring programme

Note:

TRL recommends a sample of 5% although 2% was considered adequate in Scotland. This is an issue which can be considered by HAUC (UK) when the final report is published.

- TRL have drafted a procedure to be considered by CSS and HAUC (UK)
- Further research should be considered into a national agreed method for testing for unbound layers of reinstatements.
- National results should be used for a quality management.
- The report suggests a classification methodology for reinstatement compliance should be considered

The Chair thanked Chris Walker and the rest of the project group for the work that had been put into the preparation of the report.

4. Traffic Management Act.

05.40

David Padfield and Fiona Sakwa are preparing a submission to Ministers. This will include a summary of consultation responses plus details of the big issues still to be resolved.

The plan is to submit this to Ministers by the end of July. Once the ministers have decided how matters should proceed, the DfT will need to reconvene the sub group meetings –probably in September. Implementation dates were still not absolutely confirmed, but indications are that FPN, Notices and Section 74 regulations will be early to mid 2006 and permits mid to end 2006.

There was a discussion about the amount of work to be done by the DfT (a significant amount of work needs to be done by DfT lawyers). David Padfield acknowledged that it was unlikely that additional resource would be made available within the DfT.

A plan will be discussed with the Minister and this will be made available to HAUC in due course.

The Chair said that the HAUC (UK) work programme needed to be reviewed in the light of the TMA and how the concentration of DfT efforts on the TMA is causing problems with other work streams, e.g Diversionary and Training and Accreditation. The joint Chairs would ask for a meeting with Mike Talbot to discuss the issue

Action: Joint Chairs / DfT

5. Working Group Reports.

05.41 Specification – Kevin Fuller reported on the progress of the group, and submitted a written report to the meeting.

The report looked at the results of the scoping study undertaken by the SROH Working Party. The recommendation is for a 'refresh' of the SROH to take account of changes in legislation and to also include and develop initiatives such as sustainable working and compliance testing.

The time frame is looking for a finish of the review by mid 2006, although this may be ambitious. Actual implementation of the revised Code will be sometime later. Specialist input will be required for any review and it is proposed that this be sought through HAUC (UK) or the DfT. It may also be necessary to send the revised Specification to the European Commission in Brussels for approval.

The Chair confirmed that HAUC (UK) agreed that the work should continue and agreed for it to be included in the HAUC (UK) workplan.

There was a discussion about the possibility of agreeing an interim best practice. It was agreed that this should be raised at the meeting with DfT. The Chair thanked Kevin Fuller for the report and asked for an update at the January 06 HAUC(UK) meeting.

Action: WG report at next meeting.

05.42 Diversionary Works – David Baker reported the code is now available and that the group looked forward to early publication. The Chair informed the meeting that the Highway Authorities still have a problem with C4. The authority view is that the regulations are wrong. In any event the publication of the code would be delayed because of the back log of work

within the DfT.

Mark Ostheimer said it was very disappointing that the Highway Authorities still held this view. The court case cleared the up the issues, the code reflects the current law as we understand it. There continues to be a major difference of opinion between highway authorities and utilities. BB said the status quo should be maintained.

The working group had amended the code in the light of the court judgement. It was suggested that an interim best practice document could be issued, but that a sensible solution would be for DfT to advise a way forward.

To facilitate this, it was agreed that a joint document would be prepared stating clearly the positions of both sides and that this would be forwarded to DfT for their consideration.

DP stated the DfT need a very clear explanation of what the issues are.

David Baker stated that he does not agree that the code is wrong, since it fits in with the regulations. The issue is the HA's consider that the regulations are incorrect and do not equate to the original intentions of the working group.

Action: Joint Chairs / DfT

It is important that the working group are reassured – they did exactly what they were asked to do but the Chair accepted that HAUC(UK)'s remit to the group had not been sufficiently clear as to what was being asked.

The working group has another meeting planned for next month. At this meeting they could look through the code and confirm clarifications that are agreed. The group also need to produce a paper on the current C4 issues.

Training & Accreditation Working Group

05.43

Nick Powell presented a report from the Training and Accreditation Working Group. For sometime the working group has been developing the necessary re assessment mechanisms for operatives and supervisors wanting to re-register under NRSWA. The Awarding Bodies would be ready for implementation by October. However, there is a need for regulations to be drafted and a voluntary code of practice to be produced, both of which need significant input from DfT lawyers.

The group has also started to consider costs and benefits of implementation of the re-registration and are-assessment programme in expectation of the RIA which will be published

by the DfT when the regulations are published for consultation. It was agreed that more work needed to be done on this and that it would need to align with the views expressed as part of the general TMA consultation process

The Working Group had also appended to its written report a note prepared by Findlay Taylor of RAUC Scotland on developments in Scotland. The group had agreed that items 1 and 2 of the report would be appropriate for inclusion into the English proposals. – need to spell out what they are.

The Chair thanked Nick Powell for the report and the meeting confirmed that it approved the continuation of the work. It was again highlighted that there would be delays because of the resourcing difficulties within the DfT. And would be included in the meeting of the joint Chairs and the DfT.

05.44

Records -

This group will reconvene in the near future.

Inspections – Code of Practice/ fees review -

It was agreed that there should be a Steering Group with up to 8 representatives from both the NJUG and Highway Authorities sides and specific sub groups to deal with the Code of Practice and the fees review – this is a separate review and working group not a sub-group so needs taking outside of the inspections review group. with four representations from Highway Authorities and NJUG. Secretariat was asked to arrange the first meeting.

Action: Secretariat

05.45

Conference update–

Lester Sonden reported the next meeting of the Conference Committee is planned for 28th July. Any additional feedback on the conference should be sent to Lester Sonden, Graham Eaton or Harry Pendleton.

Les Guest reported that the feedback he had received was that there was a perception of disagreement and back biting between authorities and utilities at the conference, As a HAUC(UK) group we should have a strong united front at events like the conference whilst at the same time enabling debate.

It was agreed that the Joint Chair should write to the Surveyor to start a review of the revenue share arrangement.

Action: Secretariat

6.
05.46

Temporary Traffic Signals - Update.

NJUG representatives confirmed that a paper with a legal view had been submitted to DfT for consideration by DfT lawyers. This would be an issue to be raised at the HAUC (UK) joint chairs meeting with Mike Talbot.

ACTION:

05.47

UKWIR –VISTA Project-

Les Guest reported to the meeting about the UKWIR VISTA project concerning the capturing and recording of asset records. UKWIR has engaged a number of universities to

come up with proposals. UKWIR successfully applied for DTI sponsorship which is in excess of £1million. Harry Pendleton, Frank O'Dwyer and Lester Sonden have been to meetings. There are 2 workstreams, the first mapping the underworld (asset location without excavation) and the second capturing the data and exchange of records information. All agreed that redundant assets records are important. It was acknowledged that there is blue sky thinking but some of the ideas will be capable of early implementation.

A complimentary piece of work on exchange of records is being undertaken in a collaborative fashion with input from FIG, NJUG, water and electricity companies with DfT.

05.48

Improvement Notices reported to HAUC (UK)-

LB of Hammersmith and Fulham has recently served some utility companies with Improvement Notices. The Code requires them to be reported to HAUC (UK). Consideration to be given to a process to deal with improvement notices once they are received by HAUC (UK).

5.49

Action: Secretariat

05.50

AOB.

The Chair suggested that given the meeting was for HAUC (UK) then representatives from Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland should be invited to submit reports to the quarterly meetings. The representatives from Wales who were present at the meeting agreed this was a good idea to have updates from Scotland, Wales and NI and that this would be a regular agenda item for future meetings.

Action: RAUC(S), Welsh HAUC and NIRAUC/secretariat

**7.
05.51**

Dates of next meeting: 2nd November: Venue to be advised.



Rosaleen Hubbard
Utility-Side Secretariat
NJUG
59-60 Russell Square
London, WC1B 4HP
Tel: 0870 801 8007
Fax: 0870 801 8008
Email: info@njug.co.uk

Graham Eaton
Local Authority-Side Secretariat
C/o Derbyshire County Council
Environmental Services Dept.
County Hall, Matlock
Derbyshire DE4 3AG
Tel: 01629 760062
Email: graham.eaton
@derbyshire.gov.uk

HIGHWAY AUTHORITIES & UTILITIES COMMITTEE

HIGHWAY AUTHORITIES AND UTILITIES COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE HIGHWAY AUTHORITIES AND UTILITIES COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY 2ND NOVEMBER 2005 AT THE OFFICES OF NJUG, RUSSELL SQUARE LONDON, WC1B 4HP

PRESENT

Peter Goode
Graham Eaton
Harry Pendleton - Chair
Rosaleen Hubbard
Stephen Chandler
Marc Owen
Lester Sonden
David Baker
Mark Ostheimer
Keith O'Brien
Steve Barriff
Neale Walshe
Mike Talbot
David Padfield
Les Guest
Steve Hennah
Dave Turnbull
Malcolm Taylor

Nottingham City Council
NSWHG
Atkins Global
NJUG Secretariat
Welsh Assembly
Pembrokeshire Council
Water UK
TfL
ntl
Thus
Corporation of London
Telewest
DfT
DfT
National Grid
Welsh Water
BT
Northern Ireland Electricity

1. Apologies for Absence

Chris Tunstall Highways side Chair
Peter Whitehouse
Barrie Davies
Kevin Fuller
Alan Rainford
Louise Green
Andrew Leydon
Richard Wakelen
Bill Barker
Martin Hobbs
Fiona Sakwa

Durham CC
Sandwell MBC
Welsh HAUC
Highways Chair- Specifications Group
NJUG Chair – Specifications Group
Road Services Northern Ireland
Scottish RAUC
EDF Energy
Scottish RAUC
Highways Agency
DfT

2. Notes of the Meeting on 20th April 2005

05.52

The minutes were approved as a true record.

3. **Matters Arising**

05.53 05.38

HSE and High Speed Roads

It is anticipated that the HSE will attend the next Roads Liaison Group meeting in December to discuss traffic management issues, particularly those arising from high speed roads but now also thought to be applied to lower categories. NJUG are concerned that as this is a Highways only attended meeting, there needs to be a means for them to liaise so that we are all working from the same understanding.

05.54 05.40

Traffic Management Act

The Joint Chairs attended a meeting with DfT and ministers. As a result, a timetable for TMA implementation has been published on the DfT website. A link is to be placed on the HAUC(UK) website.

Action: Secretariat

05.55 05.39

CSS Reinstatement Compliance Testing

CSS report has been completed and it will be published shortly after resolution of copyright issues. It was agreed that the report be referred to the Specifications and Inspections working groups to consider and report back to HAUC(UK) identifying any implications for their areas of interest.

Action: Secretariat

4. **Traffic Management Act**

05.56

Mike Talbot gave a report. The network management duty intervention criteria will be published for consultation by the end of the year. The meeting was informed that a number of traffic manager forums are being established around the country and the DfT has been supporting these as a mechanism for the exchange of good practice.

DfT have identified a number of issues which they have to address but they still anticipate meeting the published timetable. These include briefing requirements for the software developers, finalising monitoring arrangements and a review of the RIAs.

DfT has asked HAUC(UK) to provide representatives to join a working group looking at KPIs.

TFL and Highways Agency have also provided resources to help with DfT work (specifically permits).

The first meeting of reconvened Permits Group will be held before Christmas. Mike Talbot will chair the first meeting. As this work may have an effect on all working groups, the agreed implementation timetable may be affected.

5. Working Group Reports.

05.57 **Co-ordination** There is a meeting of the notices working group planned for 12th December.

05.58 **Reinstatement Specification** - A written report from the group was considered, which recommended a further sunset period for the approval of materials. The DfT will ask its lawyers whether the suggestion is possible. HAUC(UK) expect the advice from the DfT by the end of November.

Action: DfT

05.59 **Diversions Works** – The principal action from the last HAUC (UK) meeting was for the working group to prepare a joint document detailing the issues to go to the DfT for consideration. The Highways side has prepared a document setting out the highways side s issues. This document is to be passed to the utility side Joint Chair of the working group for review and additional comments.

The DfT has been asked to consider whether the regulations need to and can be amended and if so what would the timescale be.

Mike Talbot stated that following consideration of the above paper, if it is considered necessary, the regulations could be amended as part of the 2nd wave of TMA regulations, (i.e. 2007).

David Turnbull said that if it was going to be up to two years before any changes to regulations might be made would it not be possible to implement now based on the current regulation whilst the regulations are reviewed and potentially changed? It was agreed that HAUC(UK) would wait until it receives a view from the DfT.

**Action: David Baker
Peter Crouch**

05.60 **Training & Accreditation Working Group** – There has not been a meeting since the last HAUC(UK) meeting. There is a delay because of the need to get draft regulations, RIA's, etc from the DfT.

05.61 **Records** – It was reported that a great deal of work is taking place outside the HAUC(UK) arena into record keeping and damage avoidance. There may be a need to review timescales shown in the DfT programme to reflect the progress being made. It was also emphasised that there may be a need to radically review the code in the light of the developments being made in this field.

Mike Talbot said that the timetable would be looked at.

05.62 **Inspections** – There have been a couple of meetings where good progress has been made.

05.63 **2006 HAUC (UK) Conference Organising Committee** - Work on organising the 2006 conference is progressing well.

There is an issue about the protocol of Ministerial Speakers to take account of the location of the event.

05.64 **Working Groups: Document Approval Process** – A draft procedure has been circulated. A few suggestions were put forward and Graham Eaton will incorporate changes and re-circulate. Any other comments should be forwarded to the secretariat.

Action: Secretariat

6. **Temporary Traffic Signals.**

05.65 Mike Talbot has met with DfT lawyers. He will draft a note on his understanding of their opinion, get it confirmed by the DfT lawyers and then circulate to the Joint Chairs by the end of November.

Action: DfT

7. **Reports:**

05.66 **Northern Ireland** – A report on NIRAUC was submitted by Roads Services. It was noted that future reports should be a report from NIRAUC.

Action: NIRAUC

05.67 **Scotland**

A written report had been submitted by RAUC(S).

05.68 **Wales**

Mark Owen presented the joint report. There was a discussion about the various BT issues referred to in the report. The utilities considered that these were not relevant for a HAUC(UK) report although the highways side observed that the report was in respect of those issues being considered by the region and were therefore included in the report.

The Welsh HAUC website has been relaunched.

8. **Improvement Notice Process**

05.69 A draft process has been prepared. The purpose of the process is to ensure that HAUC(UK) is aware of what is happening but the process will be operated at regional level

with reports to HAUC(UK).

Action: Secretariat

**9.
05.70**

Safety

HAUC is aware that British / European standards applicable to High Visibility clothing have changed but the NRSWA Safety code makes reference to the superseded standards. DfT legal have advised that superseding standards are applicable. It was agreed that this information needs to be put into the public domain. A formal letter from DfT will be organised.

Action: DfT

**10.
05.71**

AOB

Thanks were given to NJUG for hosting and chairing the meeting.

The meeting was advised that this would probably be Mike Talbot's last HAUC meeting.

The Chairman recorded HAUC(UK)s thanks to Mike for his help over the many years he has been involved.

**11.
05.72**

Dates of Meetings for 2006:

Wednesday 25th January

Wednesday 26th April

Wednesday 5th July

Wednesday 11th October

**12.
05.73**

Date of next meeting:

Wednesday 25th January 2006 (Venue TBA)

Highways Agency NR&SWA S85 Process

The Agency employs Halcrow Group Ltd to build and maintain their ASD file for the NSG.

The scheme designers within the Agency [Major Projects or Area Teams] decide when the S85 notice should be issued.
[normally 5 years prior to the start of major road works or 10 years prior to major bridge replacement works]

The Scheme Designers supply the following information

Location of the scheme and the road names for all roads involved that require a S85 and/or a plan of the scheme at a scale that allows the road names to be identified.

The information is passed to a central point within the Agency [Network Management Policy team], they keep a log of all notices date served etc.

The information is then passed to Halcrow who carry out the following:-

1. Identify the USRN for the relevant roads
2. Serve a S85 notice on each undertaker by post
3. Inform the central point in the Agency when the notice was served
4. Update the type 23 NSG record with details of the S85 notice
5. Submit the amended ASD quarterly to the O.S. as concessionaires for the ASD
6. Delete time expired S85's on subsequent ASD updates

Application for NRSWA Section 85 Notice

Scheme Title: _____

Scheme Description: _____

Project Sponsor: _____

Project Number: _____

OS Grid Reference:

Scheme Start _____ Scheme End _____

Local Authority Side Roads Crossed:

Road Names _____

Drawings Attached (electronic drawings to be AutoCAD .pdf format)

Drawing No. _____ Title _____

Other Comments _____

Email to: ros.gaulton@highways.gsi.gov.uk

Hard copy to: Network Management Policy Team
Highways Agency
8W City House
New Station Street
LEEDS
LS1 4UR

Guidance on completing Application for Section 85 Notice

Scheme title: This should be the title which appears on any drawings or formal documents, such as correspondence.

Scheme Description: This should provide a full description of the works planned e.g. "Improvement to approx. 5km of the existing single carriageway A66 to dual carriageway standard between Scotch Corner and Carkin Moor. The dual carriageway will be created by constructing a new carriageway to the north of the existing A66 Trunk Road." The description should include an estimated start date.

Project Number: This can either be the project number or a reference unique to the project to aid identification

OS Grid Reference: This is the Ordinance Survey grid reference for the start and end of the scheme. Alternatively the Unique Street Reference Number can be used.

Local Authority side roads crossed: This is the most important bit of information. Both the road names and the OS grid reference should be given to aid Utilities to identify affected LHA roads.

Drawings Attached: List all the drawings attached to the application. These should be submitted in PDF format and show the full extent of the area the Section 85 will apply to. The title should indicate the number of sheets for each drawing.

Other Comments: This is a free text field for any relevant information e.g. contact details for the service providers or information regarding potential impediments to the progress of the scheme e.g. priorities of regional bodies.

When completed the form and drawings should be sent electronically to Ros Gaulton and a hard copy of both should be sent to the Network Management Policy team in Leeds.

From: Martin Hobbs
**Safety Standards and Research
Directorate**

Our ref:
Your ref:

City House
New Station Street
Leeds

cc:

GTN:
Fax GTN:
Mobile: 07710958429

10 November 2004

SA 10/01 Diversionary Works New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 – Section 85 Notices

This minute sets out the process that should be followed by Project Sponsors and Area Teams involved in the design of new works or improvement schemes that may have an implication on utility company apparatus.

Background

When the Agency carries out works for road purposes they often result in a requirement to divert utility apparatus that exists in the highway. The Diversionary Works Code of Practice (*Measures Necessary where Apparatus is Affected by Major Works (Diversionary Works) – ISBN 0-11-551149-0*) requires the promoter of the scheme to pay up to 85% of the utility costs.

As there is often a considerable time delay between the planning/design stage of a scheme and the start of construction, utility companies may continue to install new equipment in the vicinity of the scheme, potentially increasing the costs of diversion for the Agency.

Solution

Regulations made under Section 85 of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (NRSWA) provide for a highway authority to serve a notice on all the utilities for a proposed scheme. The effect of this notice is to disallow the costs of the diversion of the utility apparatus installed after the notice was served. The diversion costs of any apparatus installed after the notice would therefore be the responsibility of the Utilities. This notice can be served up to 5 years before the commencement of road improvements and 10 years before the commencement of bridge replacement work.

In order for the Agency to minimise its costs associated with Diversionary Works it is essential that the Section 85 notice is served in the correct manner and at the appropriate time during the design stage of project.

The Network Management Policy team will co-ordinate the Agency's approach to Section 85 notices. Project Sponsors and Area Teams are requested to provide information with regards to a project that requires a notice, which identifies as a minimum the location of the works, the existing street(s) that may/will be affected by the construction and the names of those streets. Other information that would be helpful but is not essential is the Unique Street Reference Number (USRN), obtained from the National Street Gazetteer and the highway authority with the maintenance responsibility.

It should be noted that this information should be provided at the earliest opportunity in order to maximise the potential of the Section 85 notice and the protection it offers to the Agency in respect to Diversionary Works Costs.

Action Required

1. Project Sponsors and Area teams shall identify schemes that require Section 85 notices to be served.
2. Information relating to those schemes shall be forwarded to the Network Management policy Team at City House, Leeds as soon as is practicable.
3. Service Providers should be advised of the arrangements.

Martin Hobbs