

Lincolnshire Permit Scheme



LiPS Consultation Report

CONTENTS

CONTENTS.....	2
1 Introduction	3
2 Summary of responses	4
2 Distribution List	6

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The Lincolnshire Permit Scheme (“the LiPS”) formal consultation ran for an initial period of 3 months commencing on March 1st 2016 with the deadline for receipt of responses no later than May 31st 2016. An online survey also formed part of the consultation process.
- 1.2 A joint meeting held by LCC and Statutory Undertakers took place on March 15th 2016 where the scheme could be discussed, and any issues raised. Following the meeting, an agreement was made to extend the consultation deadline to June 10th 2016 to allow any proposed changes to be reviewed and considered. No significant changes were made.
- 1.3 The draft Scheme Document and accompanying covering letter was issued to 691 stakeholder organisation contacts including statutory consultees DfT, neighbouring Highway Authorities, Utilities and emergency services. A full list is provided within this document.
- 1.4 Some organisations had a number of consultees within them and if known those individuals were contacted directly. The total number of email addresses / individual contacts made was 437.
- 1.5 Of the consultees, there were eight (8) stakeholder organisations individual comments on the proposed Permit Scheme received by the deadline. The online survey received 114 responses; however there were only 8 complete responses, 6 of which from members of the public who were happy with the introduction of the scheme. There were 106 incomplete responses.
- 1.6 A list of comments received are provided in this document including those from the joint meeting held on March 15th 2016.

2 Summary of Responses

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

CONSULTATION RESPONSES			
NOTE: Where responses effectively duplicate those already covered under another respondee, these are not listed or responded to individually to aid clarity.			
Name / Organisation	Scheme Doc Ref	Comment	Response
Virgin Media	3.1.2	Virgin Media are disappointed that Lincolnshire County Council's Permit Scheme and associated fee's will apply to all classification of roads. If the council chooses to apply permits to 100% of streets, contrary to advice from Ministers, Virgin Media requests that Lincolnshire County Council grant permits for category 3 and 4 roads by default and for those permits to be at zero fee levels.	The charging mechanisms are set out by regulation and fees are allowed on all roads if required by the scheme. The fees set relate to Lincolnshire County Council's need to cover the costs of operation.
Virgin Media	18.4.4	Virgin Media acknowledge that Lincolnshire County Council will be following the DfT/HAUC guidelines for applying a discount for working wholly outside traffic-sensitive times, but request that works on category 3 and 4 roads are granted by default and for those permits to be at zero fee levels.	The charging mechanisms are set out by regulation and fees are allowed on all roads if required by the scheme. The fees set relate to Lincolnshire County Council's need to cover the costs of operation.
Virgin Media	18.4.5	What happens to revenue generated from permit fees if they exceed the allowable cost of the scheme?	In the event that there is a surplus in a given year, the money will be applied towards the costs of the scheme in the next year and the fee levels adjusted accordingly as required by regulations.
Anglian Water	6.2.7	This refer to 5.5, but there isn't a 5.5 within the document	This will be amended. Please refer to 9.2
Anglian Water	9.2.4	Promoters would need to know under what circumstances an illustration is required, as promoters could not provide this on all permit applications.	Illustrations/TM will be requested by LCC on a case-by-case basis dependent on the location of works and activity proposed.
Anglian Water	9.2.7	Can this be reworded so that this is only required if anything other than the normal hand dig or mini digger is used.	Noted. The methods used by promoters can have a significant effect on the level of disruption on

		What benefit does this give?	the network. Methodologies assist in the overall permit assessment.
Anglian Water	9.2.9	Why is this necessary, under legislation we have 6 months to do interim to permanent, and at time of doing the permit application would not know when permanent would be done if we had to interim. We often plan to do permanent but then for operational reasons have to interim; this would not be known at the application stage.	Noted. This does not direct you to complete first time permanent reinstatements. This can be reworded for clarity.
Anglian Water	9.2.17	Need to add exemptions to S58 for clarity	Legislation outlines exemptions to s.58 which LiPS will adhere to.
Anglian Water	10.1	Need to define if early start requests are by email, telephone or EToN so that we have a consistent approach.	All methods stated in 10.1 are accepted by LCC for requesting early starts. The method used by the promoter could dependent on how much notification is given for the early start request.
Anglian Water	12.1.2	Under legislation it says that the Highway Authority imposes the conditions, promoters will add the conditions they believe are relevant.	Legislation states the Authority “May” impose conditions. It is essential that everyone involved in highway activities takes both the co-ordination objectives and the broader TMA objective of expediting the movement of traffic into account. If the promoter is aware of conditions relevant to their work, these should be added to the permit application. LCC may impose conditions they feel necessary.
Anglian Water	12.1.3	PMR should always be used when requesting additional conditions	PMR’s will generally be used if only changes to conditions are required in the permit application. Refusals relating to conditions may be included if there also other errors within the permit application.
Anglian Water	18	Can LCC send a proforma detailing proposed permit charges for checking and agreement on a fortnightly basis. Receipt of a months data in one go would be difficult to turn around in the required timescales.	Noted. This can be discussed individually between promoter and LCC but will not be written into the scheme document.

Anglian Water	18.3.1	If permits are charged for work carried out on fire hydrants, this will be recharged back to Lincolnshire C C by the Water Undertaker, the majority of permit schemes have the following statement in this section. · Any work undertaken on a fire hydrant.	Noted. There are also exemptions for fire hydrants in 5.3
Vodafone	9.2.6.5	Illustrations – Vodafone does not have the facility to attachment TM Plans to Permit Application. As attachments by EToN are not mandatory, please confirm the process for sending attachments by other means – for example, TM Plans reference a Permit Application but sent by email – please confirm the email address/ TRRO’s via website application.	TM Plans referencing a Permit Application sent by email will be accepted. Currently the email address for TM Plans is highways@lincolnshire.gov.uk However, due to the organisational restructure taking place this may change in the future. Should this happen, advance notification will be given to all affected parties.
Vodafone	10	Early Starts – Until the HAUC England Permit Forum Advice is agreed we suggest a method of agreeing Early Starts. Can you confirm which method you would require; e.g. - before or after a permit application has been sent.	In any case the promoters must apply for a permit giving the correct lead time. IF an early start is requested, this should be made via EToN Comment.
Vodafone	18.4.4	Working only outside Traffic Sensitivity Times/Collaboration/Incentive Works - Can we asked how you are going to manage the application of any discounts to the Fee Structure?	Promoters wishing to claim incentives provided in LiPS should provide evidence either in their permit application or via site photographs of the qualifying discount. This will then be applied when either processing your application or at draft invoice stage.
Vodafone	15	We also ask that when an Authority forced permit variation is issue, this is management to ensure no additional fee is raised.	There is no charge for Authority Imposed Variations (AIV) and discounts will be applied where required.
Vodafone	18.3	Vodafone welcomes the initiative to discount and incentivised activities but asked how will these be managed to ensure the discounts are given when Permit Fees are checked and Invoices? We believe that the additional administration required to gain the incentive may be greater than the discount being provided and suggest that this is providing automatically if the works meet the criteria.	Promoters wishing to claim incentives provided in LiPS should provide evidence either in their permit application or via site photographs of the qualifying discount. This will then be applied when either processing your application or at draft invoice stage.

Vodafone	17.2	Can you clarify that this section refers to Temporary Traffic Restriction Notices (TTRN) as which 17.1 TRRO's?	As stated, this applies to Immediate activities only as a response to an emergency closure. Planned works requiring a closure will go through TTRO process.
LCC UTILITY MEETING			
All UTILITIES	Fee Matrix	<p>The utilities expressed concern that there may be hidden charges. Lincolnshire County Council confirmed that this would not be the case. The utilities thanked Lincolnshire County Council for using common sense.</p> <p>The utilities queried why only major activity greater than 11 days duration also mentioned the use of a TTRO – what happens if utilities needed a road closure for one day or if it was needed in an emergency – would the utilities have to pay a higher rate? (Why could something not be charged for up to a three day duration). To be discussed with Mouchel.</p>	<p>The DfT issued a revised fee structure for permitting set out in paragraph 23 of the “Additional Advice Note – for developing and operating future Permit Schemes” dated February 2013. This was in response to the government’s request to all authorities who operate or intend to operate schemes to facilitate the roll-out of superfast broadband infrastructure. As a result, major works have been divided into 3 charge categories. Any works requiring a closure will attract the higher charge irrespective of duration.</p> <p>The fee structure will remain as guided by DfT.</p>
	Scheme Document		
	5.2	Temporary Traffic Control – needs clarification as to what this actually means. Agreed to amend to read "temporary traffic management". Amended	Amended
	6.2.7	Utilities referred to the reference to 5.5 Lincolnshire County Council agreed to amend – misprint.	Corrected
	9.2.7 – Methodology	What value does this add to the permit? Agreed to review.	The methods used by promoters can have a significant effect on the level of disruption on the network. Methodologies assist in the overall permit assessment. This will not be required on all permits but as requested by LCC on a case-by-case basis.

			Reworded in scheme document.
	9.2.9	Utilities indicated that sometimes they do a job and expect it to be a permanent solution and other times they have to return to a site – why have this as a condition. 9.2.9.2. explains this.	9.2 removed from scheme document and replaced with 9.2.9.2 for clarity.
	9.2.17	Section 58 – does not make any reference regarding exemptions to Section 58 and this should be added for clarity. Agreed to amend.	NRSWA 1991 (s.58) details all exemptions. The scheme document does not outline all exemptions as it will abide by those directed under NRSWA. Had all exemptions been included in the scheme document and NRSWA s.58 were to be amended in the future, the scheme document have to go out to consultation again to update and inform the changes. Referencing and abiding by NRSWA prevents the need for consultation should NRSWA s.58 be amended in the future.
	12.1.2. Conditions	Needs to be reworded – (this looks like the utilities should be putting on the conditions each time). Agreed to amend.	Under section 3.17 of the DfT Technical Specification for EToN 2013 it states: “Permit schemes introduce the concept of Conditions that can be applied to a Permit. The approach adopted is based on the promoter including Conditions in their PAA, Permit and Variation Applications. If the Primary Notice Authority is unhappy with the Conditions applied then the application is refused by issuing either a “Modification Request” or a “Refuse PAA / Permit / Variation” notification.” I would urge against changes to this in the scheme document as direction is provided in the EToN

			<p>technical specification on how conditions are applied. LCC could have a 'local' agreement that promoters apply any relevant conditions be to TS / SSS routes only.</p> <p>The promoter applying conditions also gives greater accountability in planning and managing their work and not all permits will require conditions</p>
	12.2.2.	Lincolnshire County Council confirmed that the DfT statutory guidance would be taken as read so the utilities do not have to provide mandatory conditions every time an application was submitted.	<p>Reworded.</p> <p>12.2.1 states these do not need to be applied to the permits</p>
	12.3.2	. – Agreed to amend.	Amend 12.3.2 to read – Regulation 13 provides for the Authority to impose conditions on an activity that is not yet the subject of a permit. Effectively, conditions can be discussed and agreed with the promoter within the two hour period of time between an Immediate activity starting on site and the issuing of the Immediate permit application.
	15.7.2 – Extensions	utilities asked "what criminal offence would we be looking at"? Agreed to take it back to Mouchel.	Any breach of Regulation 19 (working without a permit) and Regulation 20 (breach of conditions) is a criminal offence and liable for prosecution.
	15.10 – Multiple Excavations	Utilities asked if Lincolnshire County Council intended to enforce this. Lincolnshire County Council indicated that this would be enforced if Lincolnshire County Council were incurring additional administration costs. Do Lincolnshire County Council really need to know every single hole which is dug by utility companies? Agreed to	<p>Yes – LCC will need to know of ALL excavations as under S.59 of NRSWA 1991, all authorities have a duty to protect the structure of the street and the integrity of the apparatus in it.</p> <p>Promoters are required under s.70 of NRSWA to inform the authority</p>

		review.	of all excavations undertaken by way of registration of reinstatement and failing to do so is a criminal offence under s.70 (6).
	15.10.5	– Utility companies needed to be accurate in what they are telling Lincolnshire County Council. Registration needs to be clear "in line with Section 70" needs to be added.	Amended
	16.1 – Illegitimate Phasing	This would never happen so why have a section on it. Agreed to review	History shows that this is a common problem across the industry and has been discussed at HAUC meetings and the issue of illegitimate phasing accepted by the DfT. If promoters are confident this does not apply to them there shouldn't be any issue, however I would advise this remains so there is a clear outline of expectations should this issue arise.
	18.3.1 – Fees	Waiving fees on water hydrant works – utilities to include this point in their feedback to the consultation.	amended 5.3 to read – Testing of water hydrants, provided the work is done outside traffic-sensitive periods
	18.4.4.3 –	Discussion ensued regarding working outside traffic sensitive times. Concern was expressed that invoices needed to be sent to the utilities at least every two weeks and needed to be split as each utility company would need to scrutinize these carefully prior to payment being authorised.	Timing of invoices can be discussed and agreed individually between promoter and LCC and is not dictated within the scheme document due to promoters operating differently. Some require 28 days, others 14 days.
Other Comments			
Natural England		Natural England does not consider that the Lincolnshire Permit Scheme poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation.	

Ingoldmells Parish		Ingoldmells Parish Councillors considered the objectives and benefits of the scheme at a recent meeting of the Council and had no hesitation in giving their full support to the proposal.	
Vodafone		Vodafone is concerned that if a Permit Modification Request is made by LiPS to an application; any extra conditions are sought once only. In other Permit Schemes around the country we have seen many PMR transactions, each one asking for another condition to be added before the permit has been granted. Obviously in certain situations there may be occasions where a new condition is necessary, however these will be rare exceptions in planned and programmed works. With a One Stop Shop approach to PMR's, this will save time and resources needed elsewhere both at the authority's office and our own.	Noted. It is our intention to issue one PMR where required. If the application received is still incorrect, it will be refused and a new permit application must be submitted.
Vodafone		Operational District Files – We would request you send the Operational Files both to GEO and myself at the appropriate time so we can ensure the EToN System will be ready for Go-Live.	OD files will be sent as required to all parties prior to the introduction of permitting.
Vodafone		Permit Scheme Legal Order – Please send a copy of the Legal Order and the associated Scheme Documents, Attachments, Processes and Contact Lists to myself in advance of the introduction of the Scheme.	This will be sent to all promoters prior to the introduction of permitting.
		Some Carriageway Incursion - Until the HAUC England Permit Forum Advice agrees a Best Practice on this issue, can we agree for your Scheme what constituents ticking the EToN TM box.	It's not exactly clear what you are asking in reference to 'ticking the EToN Tm box' as EToN systems look and operate differently. If the proposed works are in the c/w but does NOT impact the available lanes to the point of requiring TM as defined in the COP then this would be classed as some carriageway incursion.
		Processing of Fees – Your statement in 14.7 reads that WBC will invoice on a Quarterly basis. You may have to amend this line as agreed at our pre-consultation meetings we discussed monthly draft and invoices.	This is inconsistent with LiPS / LCC and not taken from the scheme document. Please review as you refer to 'WBC'.

		Vodafone would ask that a Draft Permit Fee List is produced Monthly for checking by undertakers. Can you confirm this is your intention to issue draft lists and further when agreed, issue bulk invoices also on monthly basis.	LCC will work with promoters individually to agree preferred invoicing methods.
Historic England		<p>Thanks you for consulting Historic England on Lincolnshire county Council's proposals to introduce a permit scheme for the management of street works activities on the public highway across the county under Part 3 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 and the Traffic Management Permit Scheme (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015.</p> <p>We would take this opportunity to remind you to be aware of any designated heritage assets that may be affected by any individual permitted street works activities under the new scheme. In particular we would remind you that any works within any of the scheduled monuments in the county may also require Scheduled Monument Consent (SMC) in addition to consent from yourselves as the local highway authority. Historic England will of course be pleased to provide you with advice in relation to any proposed works either within or in close proximity to a scheduled monument in the future.</p>	
Market Deeping Town Council		On behalf of Market Deeping Town Council that the members are in agreement with this scheme and are pleased to see that something is being arranged to take control of the highways when works are planned	
Name / Organisation		Comment	Response
1. Had you heard of the Permit Scheme before?			
WPD		Yes	
2. Do you consider that			

<p>a Permit Scheme is suited to the needs of Lincolnshire?</p>			
<p>WPD</p>		<p>No. We think that the existing powers and responsibilities under the New Roads & Street Works Act 1991 and the Traffic Management Act 2004 are better suited to the needs of Lincolnshire. Lincolnshire is a mostly rural county with key urban centres (e.g. Lincoln, Boston, Grantham, Stamford) with a growth plan that encourages economic development (especially around increased housing) and this will add additional costs and resources to utility companies providing the essential services to support this.</p>	<p>A permit scheme has the potential to improve management of all works on local road networks and significantly reduce unnecessary disruption to road users. The new powers will also allow LCC to agree conditions to ensure that works are expedited and are undertaken in the most efficient manner. The combined effect of these powers has been to contribute to improved coordination and reduced disruption.</p> <p>LCC is not the first rural county to introduce a permit scheme and the increased discipline required under the permitting rules has improved existing processes within works promoter organisations, which has enhanced the quality of information relating to proposed works received by permit authorities.</p>
<p>3. Do you think the Permit Scheme reflects the statutory guidance for permits?</p>			
<p>WPD</p>		<p>No. There are a number of uses of the word ‘must’ that is not supported in the Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes (October 2015). Without listing each instance, as this is for Lincolnshire County Council to ensure their document is correct, an example is LiPS - 9.2.3 Description of activity – refers to information that must be included DfT Statutory Guidance – 3.27 Description of activity – refers to information that should be included Please amend the scheme to reflect the correct wording in the Statutory Guidance ensuring that all “must”, “should” and “may” references are used as defined.</p>	<p>The regulations provide a framework for EToN and in this case SHOULD only means it’s not a statutory requirement, it is still ‘strongly recommended’. Ultimately what promoters have to submit for permits is dictated by the EToN spec and if they don’t provide the required info then they will not get a permit. As this is how the EToN spec works in practice and this is the spec all permit schemes must work to, LiPS has been worded with the practicalities of EToN in mind and ultimately failing to provide enough information will mean the permit is not granted therefore for the sake of consistency with all</p>

			<p>schemes, and for the sake of being clear of the requirements of the scheme it has been worded as such. While recognising the fact that DfT use these terms differently, they are a statutory consultee and have thus far not objected to the use of must, should, may within the scheme document when outlining permit requirements.</p>
WPD		<p>There is reference to the Code of Practice for Permits. This has been withdrawn by the DfT.</p>	<p>LiPS has acknowledged in 1.3 of the Introduction that Previous Statutory Guidance and Codes of Practice on Permit Schemes are no longer valid, but may provide background information to support the initial stages of scheme development and may still reference these documents.</p>
<p>4. Do you think the Permit Scheme accurately reflects the requirements of The Traffic Management Permit Scheme (England) Regulations 2007?</p>			
WPD		<p>No. There are a number of uses of the word ‘must’ that are not supported in Regulation. There are also some instances of the EToN specification being given precedence over the Regulations. For example; LiPs – 12.1.2 ...”it is for the activity promoter to supply the required conditions as part of their permit application” SI 3327 2007 – Regulation 10 (1) – “A permit scheme shall include provision for the Permit Authority to attach conditions to permits, and shall specify the types of condition which the Permit Authority may attach.”</p>	<p>While the authority is able to impose conditions it is still for the promoter to submit with their application. We recognise this discrepancy between the regulations and the actual practicalities of the EToN spec, but we have to find a balanced way of writing the scheme doc and ultimately that has to reflect the realities of permitting – 1) there is no facility for local authorities to attach conditions to a permit response, and (2) as we need to be sure that promoters understand that the authority is not going to propose conditions on every</p>

			application as this may then then fall foul under CDM/means we are planning works in a manner that may not be suitable, (3) promoters already work in a similar manner across the country and have signed up to schemes where this is also accepted.
WPD		We would like an explanation as to why Section 69 of NRSWA is referenced in 9.2.18 as the Permit Scheme does not alter any existing obligations under this part. Its inclusion is unnecessary.	LiPS does not state its intention to alter s.69 of NRSWA. This was included as a reference of considerations when reviewing applications for works that may affect other apparatus and this is relevant to the scheme. Other NRSWA references such as s.58 are also made in the scheme.
5. Do you understand what conditions may be applied in granting a permit?			
WPD		We are aware of the Statutory Guidance for Highway Authority Permit Schemes – Permit Scheme Conditions, and note that LiPS will use these as directed. We hope that Lincolnshire County Council will use the powers to apply conditions in an appropriate and reasonable way.	
6. Are the penalties for not correctly applying for a permit clearly identified?			
WPD	Yes		
7. Are the penalties for not abiding by permit conditions clearly			

identified?			
WPD	Yes		
8. Do you think that the monitoring proposed for the Scheme is adequate?			
WPD		We note that proposals seem appropriate for the monitoring of the operational running of the scheme. We expect that Lincolnshire County Council will deliver these proposals, and look forward to seeing the regular reporting of performance. We would like to see clarity on how Lincolnshire County Council will provide evidence of the permit scheme delivering on the primary objectives listed in LiPS 2.1.	Section 20 refers to Regulation 4(d) and 16A which outlines expectations of monitoring and reviewing scheme performance.
9. Do you understand the transition arrangements for the Permit Scheme?			
WPD		Yes. Following experience with other schemes, it is suggested that discussions are had with each activity promoter who needs to re-serve existing notices as permits (starting 1 month after) so these do not all arrive on the first day of the scheme. Following EToN interoperability issues this year between WPD & LCC, there will need to be close liaison at the start of the scheme to ensure all transactions are being received correctly on both sides. This is especially important given the declaration that there will be no grace period for permit fees or Fixed Penalty Notices. We therefore expect Lincolnshire County Council staff to be fully competent in all aspects of Permit Scheme administration in order for the fees and FPN's to be applied – we do not feel it reasonable to be paying for a service where staff are still in training.	LCC has already flagged this with their IT providers as part of the transitional arrangements for the Permit Scheme and it is hoped that lessons learned from the previous interoperability issues will prevent there being a re-occurrence of preceding events. Comprehensive training will take place prior to the introduction of LiPS to ensure that staff are fully competent in all aspects of Permit Scheme administration.
WPD		We also expect that the process for managing the significant number of permit fees will be agreed an established before the scheme goes live, to prevent the situation where there is a backlog of invoices on the	LCC will work with promoters individually to agree preferred invoicing periods /methods.

		Highway Authority side, especially where the works are customer related.	
10. Are there any aspects of the Permit Scheme that require further clarification?			
WPD		<p>This may be our interpretation of the document, but the figures do not provide a compelling case for this scheme. It is not easy to understand how the Benefit figure of £64,981,889 and the Cost figure of £33,860,140 have been reached. The costs do not include the costs to Utilities, of not only the permit fee, but all of the additional costs associated with working under an all streets permit scheme. It would have been useful to have detail of the level of use of existing powers such as Section 56, Section 56A and Section 66 to understand the effectiveness of these powers in achieving Lincolnshire’s objectives, and the additional improvements expected by the Permit scheme.</p> <p>It is important to establish the current levels of congestion, or delays to road users, shown by street works (with Section 50 works shown separately), road works or events in order to clearly track the progress of the success of the permit scheme, and justify the additional costs to utility customers and Lincolnshire residents. It must also be remembered that we will still need to carry out our works, whether they are repairs, new connections, maintenance or investment works, including traffic management to ensure a safe workforce and public. The permit scheme cannot impose conditions to minimise delays that may negatively impact on the business of any works promoter or the safety of its staff or the public. We feel that the current legislation and Code of Practices under NRSWA & TMA are robust enough for Lincolnshire County Council to effectively fulfil their Network Management Duty in regards to street works and road works.</p>	<p>This CBA contained quantitative elements of analysis based on the use of QUADRO (QUeues And Delays at ROadworks) modelling to assess the potential impact of road works and the positive affect a permit scheme could have on these works. These models used traffic data together with road works volume and duration data for a selection of representative road works sites. The CBA business case calculated the cost per day for each traffic management type on each street type. As the overall benefit outweighs the cost of the scheme, this is positive and supports the move into permitting.</p>

3 Consultation Distribution List

Authorities	LCC Service Consultees
Nottinghamshire County Council	Secretary of State
Leicestershire County Council	Lincolnshire Police
	Lincoln HQ Fire and Rescue
	East Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust
Northamptonshire County Council	Environment Agency
Cambridgeshire County Council	Primary Care Trust
	English Heritage
Norfolk County Council	Lincolnshire Chamber of Commerce
Rutland County Council	National Farmers Union
City of Lincoln Council	British Horse Society
North Kesteven District Council	Country Landowners Association CPRE (Lincolnshire)
South Kesteven District Council	British Waterways DEFRA
West Lindsey District Council	Natural England Highways Agency
East Lindsey District Council	Network Rail Department for Transport
Boston Borough Council	National JAG
South Holland District Council	National JUG
	Lincolnshire Association of Local Councils
UTILITIES	LCC Operators
ANGLIAN WATER	Amvale
BT	Brylaine
ES Pipelines Ltd	Centrebus
Fulcrum Pipelines Ltd	(Head office address)
GTC	Delaine Buses
Harlaxton Energy Networks	J.R Dents Coaches
National Grid Gas Plc	Fowler's Travel
NETWORK RAIL-PROMOTERS NATIONAL	Grayscroft Coaches
Northern Powergrid (Yorkshire) plc	Haines Coaches Hunts Coaches
SEVERN TRENT WATER LTD.	Kettlewells
Telefonica (O2 (UK) Limited)	Kier Passenger Transport
T-Mobile (UK) Limited (Ericsson)	Mark Bland Travel Norfolk Green
VIRGIN MEDIA	PC Coaches
Vodafone	Redbus
Western Power Distribution	Shaws

Lincolnshire County Council LiPS Consultation Report

(Midlands)	Sleafordian
	Stagecoach in Lincolnshire
	Stagecoach in
	Peterborough
	TC Mini Coaches
	Lincoln Area Dial-a-ride
	Christ Church Community Transport
	BCS Travel Services
	P.C Coaches
	Stephensons Coaches
	D & J Dickinson

LCC Section 50's	
A & A Services (Lincoln) Ltd	JJ Mac Ltd
A C Moore Construction Ltd	JKS Civil Engineering Ltd
A Coupland (Surfacing) Ltd	(Lincoln)
A D Bly Construction Ltd	JMH Directional Drilling Ltd
A J Freezer Water Services Ltd	John Martin Hoyes Ltd
A.Coupland (Surfacing) Ltd	Johnson + Smith (Lincoln) Ltd
A.J. Freezer Water Services Ltd	K Walsh
ACM Homes Ltd	Kirk Homes Ltd
Acrabuild (Anglia) Ltd	KRB Builders Ltd
Active Works Ltd	LAC Groundworks Ltd
Adroit Utilities Ltd	Lawless Civils Ltd
Ajet Drain Services Ltd	Lincs Civil Engineering
ATB Civil Engineering Ltd	Lincs Pumps + Pipelines Ltd
Atlas Building & Civil Engineering Ltd	Lincs Water Services Ltd
AWH Utility Services Ltd	Lindum Construction
B W Cook Construction Ltd	Lindum Construction
BAM Nuttall Ltd	LMH Civil Engineering
Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board	M & J Evans Construction Ltd
Burmor Construction Ltd	Maher Millard Construction Ltd
C A Blackwell	Ltd
C G Godfrey Ltd	Manterfield Drilling Ltd
C.J. Holmes + Son Ltd	Marriott Builders
Carillion Construction Ltd	Matrix Networks Ltd
Cascadia Water Ltd	Maypine Construction Ltd
Catsurveys Group	Michael Franks
Celtic Construction	Minster Surfacing Ltd
Chris Booth	Morland Utilities Limited
Clarks Construction Services	MPC Services (UK) Limited
	Mr Ian Morris
	MSC Services (Yorkshire) Ltd
	Multiserve Utilities

Lincolnshire County Council LiPS Consultation Report

Daniel Charles Construction Ltd	NR Groundworks Ltd
DBC Plant Hire	NRI Civils Ltd
Dean Le-Hair Construction	Oakfield Construction
Diamond Pro Build Ltd	O'Boyle Brothers Ltd
Dowling Civil Engineering Ltd	P & H Construction Services Ltd
Dragon Infrastructure Solutions Ltd	P + R Plant (Hire) Ltd
Durman Stearn Civil Eng Ltd	P.J. Towe Construction Ltd
EJ Civils	P.N. Daly Ltd
Express Pipe Laying & Repairs Ltd	Pell Plant Hire Ltd
Fearn Plant Ltd	Pete Smith Site Services Ltd
Fox (Owmbly) Ltd	Plaza Builders Ltd
Fox Owmbly Ltd	PN Daly Limited
Foxhall Construction Ltd	Postland Developments
Freedom Cable Infrastructure	PWG Connections Ltd
Future Utility Solutions	R & D Construction Ltd
G F Tomlinson Building Ltd	RCD Utility Services Ltd
GEDA Construction	RG Carter Building Ltd
Gelder Group	Robert Woodhead Ltd
Giddy Construction Ltd	S.P. Bardwell Ltd
GPC Land & Water Solutions Ltd	Sean McCann Civils
Grayham Lidgett Builders Ltd	Smith Construction
Harlaxton Engineering	(Heckington) Ltd
	South Holland Internal
Services Ltd	Drainage Board
Harvey Smith	Structural Soils Ltd
Hollymark Groundworks Ltd	Sustainable Energy Connections Ltd
Howard Ward Associates	Taylor Bradley Ltd
HSL Construction Ltd	Taylor Plant Limited
Ian Morris	TDK
Infrastructure Gateway	Trent Build Ltd
J Breheny Contractors Ltd	Tyrrell Contractors Ltd
J E Spence & Son Ltd	UK Power Solutions
J J Mac Ltd	UKDN Waterflow
J Murphy & Sons Ltd	Vere Bros (Contractors) Ltd
J R Pickstock Ltd	W J Birch UK Ltd
J. Breheny Contractors	Wells Plant Hire
J. Murphy and Sons Limited	Western Power Distribution
J.E Spence & Son Ltd	Westleigh Developments Ltd
James Bratton & Co	Westmoreland Civil
Javellin Irrigation Systems Ltd	Engineering Ltd
	Witham Valley Civil
	Engineering Ltd
	YorkBuilder Ltd

Lincolnshire County Council LiPS Consultation Report

JE Spence & Son	YRS Utilities Ltd
-----------------	-------------------

Cllrs	
Councillor Bob Adams	Councillor Dawn Charmaine Morgan
Councillor Mark Guy Allan	Councillor Neil McElhinney Murray
Councillor William James Aron	Councillor Mrs Angela Mary Newton
Councillor Alison Mary Austin	Councillor Patrick Joseph O'Connor
Councillor Mrs Victoria Carolyn Ayling	Councillor Mrs Marianne Jane Overton MBE
Councillor John William Beaver	Councillor Clive Ronald Oxby
Councillor Mrs Patricia Anne Bradwell	Councillor Christopher Pain
Councillor David Brailsford	Councillor Stephen Leslie William Palmer
Councillor Christopher James Thomas Harrison Brewis	Councillor Robert Bernard Parker
Councillor Anthony Bridges	Councillor Nigel Harry Pepper
Councillor Mrs Jacqueline Brockway	Councillor Raymond John Phillips FRICS FAAV MRAC
Councillor Michael Brookes	Councillor Mrs Helen Nunziatina Joan Powell
Councillor Kevin John Clarke	Councillor Miss Elizabeth Lucy Ransome
Councillor Colin John Davie	Councillor Miss Felicity Elizabeth Ellen Ransome
Councillor Richard Graham Davies	Councillor Mrs Sue Ransome
Councillor Philip Maurice Dilks	Councillor Mrs Susan Rawlins
Councillor Sarah Rosemary Dodds	Councillor Mrs Judith Mary Renshaw
Councillor Geoffrey John Ellis	Councillor Robin Anthony Renshaw
Councillor Richard Geoffrey Fairman	Councillor Mrs Anne Elizabeth Reynolds
Councillor Ian Gordon Fleetwood	Councillor Peter Allan Robinson
Councillor Robert Lloyd Foulkes	Councillor Mrs Lesley Anne Rollings
Councillor Andrew Gibson Hagues	Councillor Reginald Alan Shore
Councillor Martin John Hill OBE	Councillor Mrs Nicola Jane Smith
Councillor John Duncomb Hough	Councillor Mrs Elizabeth Jane Sneath
Councillor Denis Colin Hoyes MBE	Councillor Charles Lewis Strange
Councillor Dean Michael Hunter-Clarke	Councillor Mrs Christine Anne Talbot
Councillor Robin James Hunter-Clarke	Councillor Thomas Martin Trollope-Bellew
Councillor Neville Ian Jackson	Councillor Anthony Herbert Turner MBE JP
Councillor Alan James Jesson	Councillor Stuart Miles Tweedale
Councillor Marc Stuart Jones	Councillor William Scrimshaw Webb
Councillor Burton Walter Keimach	Councillor Mark Anthony Whittington

Lincolnshire County Council LiPS Consultation Report

Councillor Ms Tiggs Keywood-Wainwright	Councillor Paul Wood
Councillor Stuart Francis Kinch	Councillor Mrs Susan Woolley
Councillor Rosanne Christina Kirk	Councillor Linda Wootten
Councillor Colin Edward Daniel Mair	Councillor Ray Wootten
Councillor Charles Edward Hugo Marfleet	Councillor Charles Nicholas Worth
Councillor John Rawdon Marriott	Councillor Mrs Susan Mary Wray
Councillor Robert Arthur Henry McAuley	Councillor Barry Young
Councillor Daniel McNally	

Parish Councils	
Wellingore	Osbournby
Faldingworth	Sibsey
Fenton Parish Council	Frithville With Westville Parish Council
Frampton	Toynton All Saints
North Cotes	Toynton St Peter
Ingoldmells	West Keal
Carlby Parish Council	Thornton Le Fen
Laughton	Old Bolingbroke
Scotter	Belleau Parish Meeting
Covenham St Bartholomew	Market Rasen
Nocton	Skegness
Beesby Residents Association	Snitterby
Tumby	Aslackby And Laughton
Wildmore Parish Council	West Fen
Hagworthingham	Great Limber
Londonthorpe And Harrowby Without	Coleby
Wrangle	Chairman of: North Cockerington Parish Meeting
Stickney	Stewton Parish Meeting
Eastville, Midville And New Leake Group Parish Council	Walcott (nr Billingham)
Saxilby With Ingleby	Marton And Gate Burton
South Kyme Parish Council	East Keal Parish Council
Marston Parish Council	Thurlby Parish Meeting
Willoughton Parish Council	Walcot Parish Council
Firsby Group Parish Council	Grantham
Thorpe St Peter	Lutton
Morton And Hanthorpe	Horncastle Town Council
Amber Hill	Belchford And Fulletby
Benington	Welbourn
Butterwick	Westborough And Dry Doddington Parish Council

Lincolnshire County Council LiPS Consultation Report

Freiston (nr Boston)	Foston
Knaith Parish Council	Potterhanworth
Blyton	Thoresway Parish Meeting
Cowbit	Digby
Grainthorpe	Swaton Parish Council
Cammeringham	Chairman of: Thorganby
Boothby Pagnell	Legsby Parish Meeting
Louth	Hemswell
Tetney	East Stockwith
Grayingham	Scotton
Addlethorpe	Gayton Le Marsh Parish Meeting
Market Deeping	Allington
Haconby And Stainfield	Ingham Parish Council
Market Stainton	Pointon And Sempringham
Sedgebrook	Lenton, Keisby, Hanby And Osgodby Parish Meeting
Walesby	Scamblesby Parish Council
Washingborough	Asterby And Goulceby Parish Council
Glentworth Parish Council	Stixwold And Woodhall Parish Council
Willingham Parish Council	Welton
North Hykeham	East Kirkby Parish Council
Tetford Parish Council	Utterby Parish Council
Beckingham	Toft Newton
Brant Broughton And Stragglethorpe	Sudbrooke
Saltfleetby Parish Council	Greetwell
Minting And Gautby Parish Council	Saxby
North Thoresby, Grainsby And Waithe Parish Council	Gayton Le Wold
Timberland	Springthorpe Parish Meeting
Martin	Glentham Parish Council
Woodhall Spa Parish Council	Ludborough
Hemingby	Croft
Ulceby With Fordington Parish Meeting	Halton Hologate
Kirton	Thimbleby
Pinchbeck	Great Gonerby
Horbling	Partney And Dalby Parish Council
Morton (nr Gainsborough)	Rauceby Parish Council
Witham On The Hill Parish Council	Skillington
Thurlby (nr Bourne)	Corby Glen
South Willingham	Carlton Le Moorland Parish Council
Sturton By Stow	Fishtoft
Carrington Parish Council	Algarkirk
Great Hale Parish Council	Honington Parish Meeting
Claypole	North Somercotes
Hemswell Cliff	East Ferry

Lincolnshire County Council LiPS Consultation Report

Legbourne	Sutton St James
Edenham, Grimsthorpe And Elsthorpe	Newton On Trent
Stapleford Parish Meeting	Torksey
Fotherby	Swinderby
Scampton Parish Council	Wigtoft
Strubby With Woodthorpe Parish Meeting	Caistor
Castle Bytham	Claxby Parish Council
Fiskerton	Nettleton
Withern With Stain And Tothill Parish Council	Rothwell
Swaby Group	Swallow
Welton Le Marsh	Marshchapel
Willoughby And District Parish Council	Burgh On Bain Parish Meeting
Brookenby	Eagle And Swinethorpe
Stoke Rochford And Easton Parish Council	Witham St Hughs
Bilsby And Farlesthorpe Parish Council	Binbrook
Alford	Keddington Parish Meeting
Irnham	Leadenham
Aunsby, Dembleby, Scott Willoughby And Crofton	Grimoldby And Manby
Bigby	Ashby With Scremby
Great Ponton	Aubourn And Haddington
Swayfield Parish Council	Brocklesby Parish Meeting
Fosdyke Parish Council	Scothern Parish Council
Sutterton	Dunholme
Wyberton	Wickenby
Blyborough	Gedney Parish Council
Harmston	Sutton St Edmund
Bitchfield, Bassingthorpe And Westby Parish Meeting	Langrville
Cumberworth Parish Meeting	Pickworth Village Meeting
Northorpe	Dogdyke
Scrivelsby	Coningsby Town Council
Ranby	Newton And Haceby
Heckington	Mareham On The Hill
Mareham Le Fen	Bratoft Parish Meeting
Tattershall With Thorpe Parish Council	Boothby Graffoe Parish Meeting
West Ashby	Norton Disney
Riseholme	Upton
Hogsthorpe	Bucknall, Tupholme And Waddingworth Parish Council
Holton Cum Beckering Parish Meeting	South Witham
Sutton Bridge	Rippingale
Baumber	Sleaford Town Council
Long Bennington	Wilsford

Lincolnshire County Council LiPS Consultation Report

Mavis Enderby Parish Meeting	Little Hale
Harlaxton	Kirkby La Thorpe
Heighington Parish Council	Holbeach
Bicker Parish Council	Broadholme
Donington	Bardney Group Parish Council
Skidbrooke With Saltfleet Haven	Canwick Parish Council
South Somercotes Parish Council	Kirkby Underwood
Theddlethorpe Group	Brinkhill Parish Meeting
Ruskington	Maltby Le Marsh
Cranwell And Byard's Leap Parish Council	Kexby
Nettleham	Deeping St Nicholas
Anwick	Skellingthorpe
Swineshead Parish Council	Fillingham Parish Meeting
Orby	Pilham Parish Meeting
Mablethorpe And Sutton	Little Bytham
Haltham	Waddington
Harrington Parish Meeting	Spilsby
Deeping St James	Heapham Parish Meeting
Claxby With Moorby Parish Council	Caythorpe And Freiston Parish Council
Belton And Manthorpe Parish Council	Ashby, Bloxholm, Temple Bruer, Temple High Grange
Normanby By Spital	Little Sutton Parish Meeting
Denton	Horsington
Hough On The Hill	Langworth Group Parish Council
Dunston	Stickford
Great Sturton	Brattleby
Billingborough	Quadring
Asgarby And Howell	Bracebridge Heath Parish Council
Dowsby	Crowland
Dorrington	Branston And Mere
Barrowby	Fulstow
Silk Willoughby	South Kelsey
Ancaster	Friskney
Edlington With Wispington Parish Council	Aby With Greenfield
Ludford	Stamford
Little Cawthorpe	Huttoft
Kettlethorpe	Woolsthorpe By Belvoir
Uffington	Lincoln City Council
Stow	East And West Barkwith Parish Council
Burton By Lincoln	Swinhope
Ewerby And Evedon	Fulbeck Parish Council
Langtoft	Brampton Parish Meeting
Gainsborough	Tydd St Mary

Lincolnshire County Council LiPS Consultation Report

Fleet Parish Council	Long Sutton
Maidenwell Parish Meeting	Middle Rasen
Grasby	Markby
Tealby	Careby, Aunby And Holywell
Tallington	Gosberton
Harpwell Parish Meeting	Rand
Baston	Benniworth
Chapel St Leonards	Buslingthorpe Parish Meeting
Old Leake	Claythorpe - No Parish Meeting Held
Burwell	Conisholme Parish Meeting
Thorpe On The Hill	Dunsby Parish Meeting
Bassingham	Goltotho Parish Meeting
Barkston And Syston Parish Council	Little Grimsby
Bishop Norton	Riby
North Kyme	Cherry Willingham
Colsterworth And District Parish Council	Muckton Parish Meeting
Gedney Hill	Waddingham
Ingoldsby	Keelby
Heydour, Oasby & Aisby	Folkingham
Surfleet	Wragby
Whaplode Parish Council	Holton Le Clay
Anderby	Wainfleet St Mary
Mumby	Wainfleet All Saints Parish Council
Corringham Parish Council	Alvingham
Roughton Parish Council	Hackthorn And Cold Hanworth
Kirkby On Bain	Spridlington
Hundleby	Brothertoft With Holland Fen
Threekingham Parish Meeting	North Scarle
Barholm And Stowe	Old Somerby
Donington On Bain	Metheringham Parish Council
Greatford	Reepham
Leverton	Langton By Spilsby Parish Council
South Cockerington	Revesby
Hougham	South Hykeham
Doddington And Whisby	Owersby
Swinstead	Lissington
Hatton Parish Meeting	North Kelsey
Tathwell And Haugham Parish Council	Rowston Parish Meeting
Ropsley And District	Hardwick Parish Meeting
Carlton Scroop And Normanton On Cliffe Parish Council	Thonock
Scredington Parish Council	Billingham
Helpringham	Lea
South Carlton	Stubton
Bourne	Weston

Lincolnshire County Council LiPS Consultation Report

West Deeping	Caenby Parish Meeting
Burgh Le Marsh Town Council	Toft Cum Lound And Manthorpe Parish Council
Navenby	Braceborough And Wilsthorpe Parish Council
Scopwick	Welton Le Wold
Leasingham Parish Council	Moulton
North Carlton Parish Meeting	Osgodby Parish Council
Great Carlton And Little Carlton Parish Council	Owmbly By Spital

This page is intentionally left blank