

## Agenda

Notice of a public meeting of

Environment Directorate -Corporate Director and Executive Member - Highways and Transportation

To: Councillor Keane Duncan.

Date: Friday, 12th April, 2024

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Via Microsoft Teams

## **Business**

#### Items for Corporate Director decision

1. Proposed Department of Transport Consultation Responses for Electric Vehicle Charging (Pages 3 - 10)

#### Future Decisions for Chief Finance Officer - For Consultation

2. Traffic Signal Obsolescence Grant - Grant Acceptance

(Pages 11 - 20)

Barry Khan Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services)

County Hall Northallerton

08 April 2024

This page is intentionally left blank

## Agenda Item 1

## **North Yorkshire Council**

## **Executive Members**

## 12 April 2024

### Proposed Department of Transport Consultation Responses for Electric Vehicle Charging

#### Report of the Assistant Director – Highways and Transportation, Parking Services, Street Scene, Parks, and Grounds

#### 1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To update the Corporate Director on the most recent consultation undertaken by Department for Transport (DfT) in relation to proposed changes to section 48 of the New Roads and Street Works Act (NRSWA) in relation to the installation of electric vehicle infrastructure on the network. This briefing note sets out the proposed responses to the consultation questions.

#### 2.0 SUMMARY

- 2.1 Following the government's announcement of its "Plan for Drivers" on 02 October 2023, measures were included to help fix roads faster and encourage efficient Street Works.
- 2.2 As a result of this, on the 05 February 2024, the DfT opened a consultation exercise on proposed changes to the current legislation under Section 48 of the New Roads and Street Works Act with specific focus on the installation of electric vehicle infrastructure on the public road network.
- 2.3 In line with many other councils and local authority representative groups, we propose using the consultation to feed back our response, which is set out as Appendix A to this briefing note.

#### 3.0 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 As part of the wider strategy to support Electric Vehicle (EV) uptake, the government is looking at other reforms. Permitted development rights are a statutory provision under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2011.
- 3.2 This legislation allows for the installation of charge points on properties with off-street parking in most circumstances. Permitted development rights enable those with off-street parking to install either a wall-mounted or a free-standing charge point without planning permission being required.
- 3.3 The Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) recently amended permitted development rights to help scale up and remove barriers to EV charging rollout.
- 3.4 The legislation now enables Highway Authorities (HA) to appoint charge point providers to install public EV charge points on their behalf. This will result in more EV charge points being delivered further and faster across the country as it means Highway Authorities can also install their own charging infrastructure via EV ChargePoint Operators (EV CPOs). However, there is still a need to support organisations that seek to install infrastructure on the public highway without HA involvement.

## Page 3

3.5 Section 115E of the Highways Act 1980 allows for the execution of works by persons other than councils or those with statutory undertaker status. Historically North Yorkshire Council (NYC) have never executed Section 115E of the Highways Act as the same permissions can be granted to those with a Section 50 or a Section 171 licence under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991.

#### 4.0 CONSULTATION OVERVIEW

- 4.1 The consultation proposes two options, one of which calls for no change at all and the other, to amend the current legislation to all EV charge point Operators to work via permits instead of section 50 licences
  - i. No change to the legislation
- 4.2 In the first proposal, the DfT will further develop the guidance for good practice relating to section 50 licences in an attempt to help reduce the time it takes for applicants to obtain a licence and for the Authority to process them
- 4.3 An update to the Specification for the Reinstatement of Highway Openings will also be updated to include guidance on the installation of EV infrastructure.
   ii. Grant EVCPOs the right to carry out Street Works using permits rather than a licence.
- 4.4 It would be much cheaper and quicker for EV CPOs to be able to obtain a permit than a section 50 licence.
- 4.5 Fees and timescales for permits are set out in statutory guidance and are consistent in every HA area.
- 4.6 It will help both HAs and EV CPOs to better coordinate works and make it easier to establish ownership of apparatus. Information about planned and live works would be included in the open data that the DfT streams to a range of date users.
- 4.7 EV CPOs must, as now, comply with other NRSWA requirements, such as those relating to reinstatements and safety, A further framework is to be developed to ensure EV CPO's are verified before they are given code powers under the Street Works Act.
- 4.8 Granting EV CPOs the right to carry out street works would mean EV CPOs accessing the permit regime as a non-statutory undertaker. This would be new to the permitting regime. As such, we would consider issuing new guidance or amending our existing guidance to support both EV CPOs and HAs in their operations.
- 4.9 NYC's preference would be to amend the legislation to allow EV CPO's to submit permits as it is a much more streamlined process for both the applicant and the Authority and ultimately takes less officer time, whilst ensuring ownership of apparatus.
- 4.10 In the event that EV CPO's are given the right to submit permits, the consultation proposes an amendment to Section 115E of the Highways Act. It appears that some Authorities are requesting both section 50 licences and a section 115E from EV CPOs in order to carry out works. The proposal predicts that if EV CPOs are given the right to request permits, Section 115E would not be required.
- 4.11 NYC historically has never requested a Section 115E as the section 50 licence is believed to cover the same permissions. As a result, we support the proposed amendments to the legislation.

#### 5.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

5.1 The alternative option proposed by DfT to do nothing would result in no changes taking place, however given the potential impact that an influx of EV CPOs would have using section 50 would be a detriment to the team and would cause delay to the EV ChargePoint operators in undertaking their works.

#### 6.0 IMPACT ON OTHER SERVICES/ORGANISATIONS

- 6.1 There is the potential increase in workload for the permit team in assessing these EV charging permits, however some of the resource, otherwise processing the Section 50 licences can be shifted to permits. Clarification in terms of expected workloads have been highlighted in the consultation to determine if additional resource will be required.
- 6.2 The quality of the permit submissions will also dictate how much time is attributed to assessing the works. Poor quality will result in an increase in change requests from the Authority. Clarification of what the proposed framework for the EV CPOs will include has been sought in the consultation to ensure that they have the relevant Street Works qualifications and permit experience.

#### 7.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 The financial implications of the changes proposed by the consultation are in relation to officer time and the charge for permits. Permit charges in some cases, could be cheaper for the Undertaker than a licence, however, permits are a much faster way to process the works than via a licence and will ultimately mean that less officer time is required to assess the permit. It's important to note that the authority will still be obtaining income through the permit fee process.

#### 8.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 There will be no legal implications as the proposal is to amend the current legislation. Any changes will be set in law.

#### 9.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

9.1 No equalities implications foreseen see EIA screening form Appendix B

#### **10.0 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS**

10.1 No climate change implications foreseen

#### 11.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 11.1 Although there are elements of this latest proposal, which are more palatable and pragmatic, there are still some aspects that require further clarification and consider it appropriate to respond accordingly.
- 11.2. Officers have produced a draft response to the consultation questions, which is set out as Appendix A to this briefing note.

#### 12.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

12.1 Although there are elements of this proposal, which are more palatable and pragmatic, there are still some aspects that require further clarification and consider it appropriate to respond accordingly.

## Page 5

12.2 A draft response to the consultation questions, which is set out as Appendix A to this briefing note.

#### 13.0 RECOMMENDATION

13.1 Subject to any comments received, it is recommended that the Corporate Director for Environment, in consultation with the Executive Member for Highways and Transportation agree to the submission of the proposed response to the DfT, as attached at Appendix A for submission on 12 April 2024

#### **APPENDICES:**

Appendix A – Consultation questions and responses. Appendix B- EIA Screening form

#### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:**

DfT EV charging consultation Street works access: electric vehicle chargepoint operators - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Barrie Mason

Highways and Transportation, Parking Services, Street Scene, Parks and Grounds Assistant Director County Hall Northallerton 20 February 2024

Report Author – Alex Hollifield, Team Leader, Network Information and Compliance Presenter of Report – Allan McVeigh, Head of Network Strategy

Page 6

#### Questions

- 1. Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to give electric chargepoint operators access to permits rather than licences? Agree with the proposal to implement permits rather than licences.
- 2. What do you believe would be the benefits of giving electric vehicle chargepoint operators access to the permit regime rather than licences? Are there any specific impacts or consequences that you believe DfT should consider? (These benefits should be in addition to the <u>benefits already listed</u>.)

The process would be a lot faster for both the applicant and the team to process. Section 50's often involve a number of internal departments to respond in terms of searches which can often lead to delay in processing them.

Often Section 50 applications have to be initially rejected due to the information on them being insufficient such as out of date plans or NRSWA accreditations expiring. This information wouldn't be required through permitting as long as the framework suggested in this consultation is sufficient and includes these aspects.

3. What do you believe would be any drawbacks of giving electric vehicle chargepoint operators access to the permit regime rather than licences? Are there any specific impacts or consequences that you believe DfT should consider? (These challenges should be in addition to the <u>challenges already listed</u>.)

Consideration needs to be given to the fees as there is the potential loss of S50 income, however, there will be still be income received

Need to establish levels on additional permits and measure the impact this will have on the existing permitting team.

Clarification required as to the enforcement aspect. This is a non-statutory undertaker, will they be subject to the same inspection regime in relation to defects/ performance measures as a as statutory undertaker. Will this mean that the Authority lose their powers under NRSWA to enforce.

Often Section 50 contractors don't have the NRSWA/ Street Works knowledge around permits/ submissions of start/ sops/ registrations despite this being part of the licence. Clarification is needed ats to whether the suggested framework includes specific Street Works knowledge including NRSWA and the SROH.

4. Do you agree or disagree that an amendment should be made to section 115 of the Highways Act 1980 to prevent HAs from granting permission under section 115E for EV chargepoint installation where this is capable of being authorised by a permit?

Agree. NYC historically do not use 115E of the Highways Act as non- statutory undertakers are covered under a S50/S171 licence. Change in the legislation should not have a direct impact.

5. How many people are involved in processing section 50 applications?

7 technical assistants, 10 different search departments for permissions, including managers, 6 coordinators once the application has been licenced. Managerial time in resolving issues, 1 FPN officer, 12 inspectors.

6. What is the average fee you currently charge for one section 50 application from an EV chargepoint operator?

£449.98(incl. 1 inspection unit) + any additional inspection units

15 Working Days or Less	1 Inspection Unit
Between 16 and 30 Working Days	2 Inspection Units (Additional £150.00)
Greater than 30 Working Days	3 Inspection Units (Additional £300.00)



- How many section 50 applications did you receive from EV chargepoint operators in 2022?
   3
- 8. On average, how many hours are required to process a section 50 application? Between 5- 6 hours dependent on the quality of the initial application.
- 9. How many people are involved in processing permit applications via Street Manager? 12
- 10. On average, how many hours are required to process a permit application via Street Manager?

30 mins if the quality of the permit is acceptable and the TM doesn't have the potential to impact the network significantly. 1-2 hours per permit if variations/ change requests are submitted as well as poor quality permits or more complex traffic management including suspension of buses or parking.

**Initial equality impact assessment screening form** (As of October 2015 this form replaces 'Record of decision not to carry out an EIA<sup>2</sup>)

This form records an equality screening process to determine the relevance of equality to a proposal, and a decision whether or not a full EIA would be appropriate or proportionate.

Directorate	Environment			
Service area	Highways and Transportation			
Proposal being screened	Approval of consultation propo undertake works via permitting		Chargepoint (	Dperators to
Officer(s) carrying out screening	Alex Hollifield			
What are you proposing to do?	Allow EVCPOs powers to app under NRSWA	ly for permit	s instead of se	ection 50 licences
Why are you proposing this? What are the desired outcomes?	This is as a result of a propositive EV chargepoints rollout to unc			ransport to allow
Does the proposal involve a significant commitment or removal of resources? Please give details.	No			
Is there likely to be characteristics as of characteristics? As part of this assess • To what extent is characteristics? • Does the propose	an adverse impact on people defined by the Equality Act 20 sment, please consider the follo this service used by particular al relate to functions that previou os have different needs or expe	o <b>10, or NÝC</b> pwing questi groups of pe us consultati	C's additional ons: cople with prote ion has identifi	ected ed as important?
impact or you have	istic it is considered that ther ticked 'Don't know/no info av oportionate. You are advised ubt.	vailable', th	en a full EIA s	should be carried
		Vaa		
Protected characte	ristic	Yes	No	Don't know/No info available
Age	ristic	Yes	✓	know/No info
Age Disability	ristic	Yes		know/No info
Age	ristic		✓	know/No info
Age Disability	ristic		✓ ✓ ✓	know/No info
Age Disability Sex (Gender)	ristic		✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	know/No info

Marriage or civil partnership       ✓         NYCC additional characteristic         People in rural areas       ✓         People on a low income       ✓         Carer (unpaid family or friend)       ✓         Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts (e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.       No         Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.       EIA not relevant or proportionate:       Continue to full EIA:         Reason for decision       No adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.       Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)		1			
Marriage or civil partnership <ul> <li>Marriage or civil partnership</li> <li>MYCC additional characteristic</li> </ul> People in rural areas <ul> <li>People on a low income</li> <li>✓</li> <li>Carer (unpaid family or friend)</li> <li>✓</li> </ul> Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts (e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.         No           Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.         EIA not relevant or proportionate:         Continue to full EIA:           Reason for decision         No adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.         No adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.           Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)         Barrie Mason         Description	Religion or belief		-		
NYCC additional characteristic       Image of our partnership       Image of our partnership         People in rural areas       Image of our partnership       Image of our partnership         People on a low income       Image of our partnership       Image of our partnership         Carer (unpaid family or friend)       Image of our partnership       Image of our partnership         Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts (e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.       No         Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.       EIA not relevant or proportionate:         Decision (Please tick one option)       EIA not relevant or proportionate:       Continue to full EIA: Proportionate:         Reason for decision       No adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.       Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)	Pregnancy or maternity		$\checkmark$		
People in rural areas       ✓         People on a low income       ✓         Carer (unpaid family or friend)       ✓         Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts (e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.       No         Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.       EIA not relevant or proportionate:         Decision (Please tick one option)       EIA not relevant or proportionate:       Continue to full EIA:         Reason for decision       No adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.         Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)       Barrie Mason	Marriage or civil partnership		$\checkmark$		
People on a low income       ✓         Carer (unpaid family or friend)       ✓         Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts (e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.       No         Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.       EIA not relevant or proportionate:         Decision (Please tick one option)       EIA not relevant or proportionate:       Continue to full EIA:         Reason for decision       No adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.         Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)       Barrie Mason	NYCC additional characteristic	•			
Carer (unpaid family or friend)       ✓         Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts (e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.       No         Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.       EIA not relevant or proportionate:       Continue to full EIA:         Reason for decision       No adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.         Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)       Barrie Mason	People in rural areas		✓		
Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts (e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.NoWill the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.EIA not relevant or proportionate:Decision (Please tick one option)EIA not relevant or proportionate:Continue to full EIA:Reason for decisionNo adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)Barrie Mason	People on a low income		✓		
there are known inequalities/probable impacts (e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.       Image: space stress of the set o	Carer (unpaid family or friend)		✓		
(e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.         Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.         Decision (Please tick one option)       EIA not relevant or proportionate:       Continue to full EIA:         Reason for decision       No adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.         Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)       Barrie Mason	Does the proposal relate to an area where	No			
transport)? Please give details.         Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.         Decision (Please tick one option)       EIA not relevant or proportionate:       Continue to full EIA:         Reason for decision       No adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.         Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)       Barrie Mason	there are known inequalities/probable impacts				
Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.EIA not relevant or proportionate:Continue to full EIA:Decision (Please tick one option)EIA not relevant or proportionate:Continue to full EIA:Reason for decisionNo adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)Barrie Mason					
how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.EIA not relevant or proportionate:Continue to full EIA:Decision (Please tick one option)EIA not relevant or proportionate:Continue to full EIA:Reason for decisionNo adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)Barrie Mason	transport)? Please give details.				
partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.EIA not relevant or proportionate:Continue to full EIA:Decision (Please tick one option)EIA not relevant or proportionate:Continue to full EIA:Reason for decisionNo adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)Barrie Mason					
organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.       EIA not       Continue to full EIA:         Decision (Please tick one option)       EIA not relevant or proportionate:       To full EIA:         Reason for decision       No adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.         Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)       Barrie Mason					
characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.       EIA not continue to full EIA:         Decision (Please tick one option)       EIA not relevant or proportionate:       Continue to full EIA:         Reason for decision       No adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.       Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)					
reached this conclusion.       EIA not       Continue         Decision (Please tick one option)       EIA not       to full EIA:         relevant or       proportionate:       to full EIA:         Reason for decision       No adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.         Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)       Barrie Mason					
Decision (Please tick one option)       EIA not relevant or proportionate:       Continue to full EIA:         Reason for decision       No adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.         Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)       Barrie Mason					
relevant or proportionate:       to full EIA:         Reason for decision       No adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.         Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)       Barrie Mason	reached this conclusion.			•	
proportionate:     proportionate:       Reason for decision     No adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.       Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)     Barrie Mason	Decision (Please tick one option)	EIA not		Continue	
Reason for decisionNo adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics.Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)Barrie Mason				to full EIA:	
Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)       Barrie Mason					
Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent) Barrie Mason	Reason for decision			any of the pro	otected
•		characteristics			
Date 04/04/2024	Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)	Barrie Mason			
Date 04/04/2024					
	Date	04/04/2024			

# Agenda Item 2

## **North Yorkshire Council**

## Assistant Director Resources: Environment

## 12 April 2024

## **Traffic Signal Obsolescence Grant: Grant Acceptance**

### Report of the Assistant Director – Highways and Transportation, Parking Services, Street Scene, Parks, and Grounds

#### 1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To seek approval from the Assistant Director Resources - Environment to accept £117,151.93 from the Traffic Signal Obsolescence Grant, based on the Integrated Transport Block allocation grant formula.

#### 2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 In November 2023, the Department for Transport (DfT) made £30M of funding available for traffic signals maintenance and upgrade through the Traffic Signal Obsolescence Grant (TSOG), £10M of which was to be distributed automatically to eligible English highway authorities. The remaining £20M was available to local authorities to bid into via a challenge application process.
- 2.2 NYC submitted a bid, but following a recent DfT announcement, the Council was advised it had been unsuccessful. Therefore, this report is focused solely on seeking approval to accept the automatic formula-based allocation.
- 2.3 The TSOG is targeted at upgrading obsolete traffic signal systems to improve reliability, primarily at sites using halogen lamps and legacy 2g and 3g communications. Considering its unsuccessful bid, officers are currently reviewing the options for how the formula allocated funding will be spent, but it will likely include continued replacement of its remaining halogen lamp traffic signals, associated equipment and signal controllers, with ELV technology.
- 2.4 The Authority is required no later than 30th April 2024 to produce a list of the schemes you intend to deliver with this grant funding.
- 2.5 The Chief Executive and Chief Internal Auditor of each Authority will be required to sign and return the Department for Transport a declaration, included in the grant conditions, to be received no later than 31st October 2024.

#### 3.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 NYC's allocation from the £10M of TSOG is allocated, automatically, according to existing Integrated Transport Block formula funding and is in addition to existing Local Transport Plan (LTP) capital allocations. This funding has been issued under the same grant conditions as the main capital block funding under Specific Grant Determination (2023/24): No.31/6681 and is provided as non-ring-fenced capital grant and is to be spent by 31st March 2026. This relates to capital funding of £117,151.93 and no additional match funding is required from NYC.

Page 11

#### 4.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The draft Terms and Conditions for the grant have not yet been reviewed by Legal Services. If any of the terms and conditions present an unacceptable risk for the Council, then the grant offer would be declined.
- 4.2 Any expenditure of the grant will be in line with the Subsidy Control Act 2022.
- 4.3 Any contracts entered into in respect of the grant funding will be in accordance with the Council's Procurement and Contract Procedure Rules and, if relevant, the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.

#### 5.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

5.1 There are considered to be no equality implications arising from the proposal. See Appendix A for Equalities Impact Assessment screening form.

#### 6.0 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS

6.1 There are considered to be only positive climate change impact arising from the improvement of traffic signals achieved through improved performance reducing congestion, delay and associated vehicle carbon emissions. Also, there are energy savings from switching to LEDs with lower energy consumption, longer lasting and more reliable equipment requiring fewer maintenance trips. See Appendix B for Climate Change Impact Assessment.

#### 7.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 To better maintain and upgrade obsolete traffic signal stock and to improve asset reliability and service resilience,

#### 8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

8.1 It is recommended that the Assistant Director Resources - Environment approves acceptance of the automatically allocated formula based grant of £117,151.93

#### **APPENDICES:**

Appendix A – Equalities Impact Assessment Screening Form Appendix B – Climate Change Impact Assessment

#### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:**

Barrie Mason Highways and Transportation, Parking Services, Street Scene, Parks and Grounds Assistant Director County Hall Northallerton 30 November 2023

Report Author – Allan McVeigh Presenter of Report – Allan McVeigh

Page 12

Initial equality impact assessment screening form This form records an equality screening process to determine the relevance of equality to a proposal, and a decision whether or not a full EIA would be appropriate or proportionate.

Directorate	Environment
Service area	Highways and Transportation
Proposal being screened	Acceptance of Traffic Signals Obsolescence Grant
Officer(s) carrying out screening	Allan McVeigh
What are you proposing to do?	Accept the formula allocated Traffic Signals
	Obsolescence Grant to maintain and upgrade the asset.
Why are you proposing this? What are the	To replace obsolete equipment, improve asset resilience
desired outcomes?	and business continuity.
Does the proposal involve a significant	No
commitment or removal of resources?	
Please give details.	

Impact on people with any of the following protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, or NYC's additional agreed characteristics

As part of this assessment, please consider the following questions:

- To what extent is this service used by particular groups of people with protected characteristics?
- Does the proposal relate to functions that previous consultation has identified as important?
- Do different groups have different needs or experiences in the area the proposal relates to?

If for any characteristic it is considered that there is likely to be an adverse impact or you have ticked 'Don't know/no info available', then a full EIA should be carried out where this is proportionate. You are advised to speak to your directorate representative for advice if you are in any doubt.

Protected characteristic	Potential f	or adverse impact	Don't know/No	
	Yes	No	info available	
Age		No		
Disability		No		
Sex		No		
Race		No		
Sexual orientation		No		
Gender reassignment		No		
Religion or belief		No		
Pregnancy or maternity		No		
Marriage or civil partnership		No		
People in rural areas		No		
People on a low income		No		
Carer (unpaid family or friend)		No		
Are from the Armed Forces Community		No		
Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts (for example, disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.	No			
Will the proposal have a significant effect	No			
on how other organisations operate? (for				
example, partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do				

## Appendix A

any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.				
Decision (Please tick one option)	EIA not relevant or proportionate:	~	Continue to full EIA:	
Reason for decision	Full EIA not requ	uired.		
Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)	Barrie Mason			
Date	03/04/2024			

#### Climate change impact assessment

The purpose of this assessment is to help us understand the likely impacts of our decisions on the environment of North Yorkshire and on our aspiration to achieve net carbon neutrality by 2030, or as close to that date as possible. The intention is to mitigate negative effects and identify projects which will have positive effects.

This document should be completed in consultation with the supporting guidance. The final document will be published as part of the decision making process and should be written in Plain English.

If you have any additional queries which are not covered by the guidance please email <u>climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk</u>

#### Version 2: amended 11 August 2021

Please note: You may not need to undertake this assessment if your proposal will be subject to any of the following: Planning Permission Environmental Impact Assessment Strategic Environmental Assessment

However, you will still need to summarise your findings in the summary section of the form below.

Please contact climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk for advice.

Title of proposal	Acceptance of Traffic Signals Obsolescence Grant	
Brief description of proposal	Accept Traffic Signals Obsolescence Grant	
Directorate	Environment	
Service area	Highways and Transportation	
Lead officer	Allan McVeigh	
Names and roles of other people involved in carrying out the impact assessment	N/A	
Date impact assessment started	22 March 2024	

#### **Options appraisal**

Were any other options considered in trying to achieve the aim of this project? If so, please give brief details and explain why alternative options were not progressed.

N/A

What impact will this proposal have on council budgets? Will it be cost neutral, have increased cost or reduce costs?

Please explain briefly why this will be the result, detailing estimated savings or costs where this is possible.

Acceptance of the formula-based grant will reduce the pressure on existing capital budgets to the value of the allocation.

	How will this proposion the environment? N.B. There may be sh negative impact and positive impact. Plea all potential impacts lifetime of a project a an explanation.	hort term longer term ise include over the	Positive impact (Place a X in the box below where	No impact (Place a X in the box below where	Negative impact (Place a X in the box below where	Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale? Where possible/relevant please include: • Changes over and above business as usual • Evidence or measurement of effect • Figures for CO <sub>2</sub> e • Links to relevant documents	Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.	Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.
כ	Minimise <b>greenhouse gas emissions</b> e.g. reducing emissions from travel, increasing	from travel	Y			Improving the operation of traffic signals results in more efficient highway network reducing congestion, delay and vehicle emissions.		
	energy efficiencies	Emissions from construction		Y				
		Emissions from running of buildings		Y				
		Emissions from data storage		Y				
		Other		Y		Further benefits achieved from switching to LEDs signals are, lower energy consumption, longer lasting and more reliable equipment requiring fewer maintenance trips and associated vehicle emissions.		

	How will this proposal impact on the environment? N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.	x belo	No impact (Place a X in the box below where	Negative impact (Place a X in the box below where	<ul> <li>Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?</li> <li>Where possible/relevant please include: <ul> <li>Changes over and above business as usual</li> <li>Evidence or measurement of effect</li> <li>Figures for CO<sub>2</sub>e</li> <li>Links to relevant documents</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.	Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.
J	Minimise <b>waste:</b> Reduce, reuse, recycle and compost e.g. reducing use of single use plastic		Y				
	Reduce water consumption		Y				
	Minimise <b>pollution</b> (including air, land, water, light and noise)	Y			The benefits of improved traffic signal operation will contribute to meeting air quality targets and noise reduction.In addition to this, LED signals are adaptive to light condition and dim during the dark to minimise light pollution.Greater reliability of equipment reduces the need for engineers to travel to site to carry out repairs reducing travel and vehicle emissions.		
	Ensure <b>resilience</b> to the effects of climate change e.g. reducing flood risk, mitigating effects of drier, hotter summers	Y			The reduction of vehicle emissions will contribute to lower carbon footprint and climate change effects.		

How will this proposal impact on the environment? N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.	Positive impact (Place a X in the box below where	No impact (Place a X in the box below where	Negative impact (Place a X in the box below where	<ul> <li>Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?</li> <li>Where possible/relevant please include: <ul> <li>Changes over and above business as usual</li> <li>Evidence or measurement of effect</li> <li>Figures for CO<sub>2</sub>e</li> <li>Links to relevant documents</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.	Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.
Enhance <b>conservation</b> and wildlife J		Y				
Safeguard the distinctive characteristics, features and special qualities of North Yorkshire's landscape	Y			Improving the operation and efficiency of traffic signals will reduce congestion and delay and therefore create a better highway environment, reducing the impacts of vehicle emissions on the natural and historic built environment.		
Other (please state below)		Y				

Are there any recognised good practice environmental standards in relation to this proposal? If so, please detail how this proposal meets those standards.

**Summary** Summarise the findings of your impact assessment, including impacts, the recommendation in relation to addressing impacts, including any legal advice, and next steps. This summary should be used as part of the report to the decision maker.

Better maintenance and upgrade of the asset will result in less energy consumption and improved resilience.

#### Sign off section

This climate change impact assessment was completed by:

Name	Allan McVeigh	
Job title	Head of Network Strategy	
Service area	Highways and Transportation	
Directorate	Environment	
Signature		
Completion date	22 March 2024	
	· · ·	

Authorised by relevant Assistant Director (signature): Barrie Mason

#### Date: 03/04/2024