

**Amendment to the Safety at Street Works and Road Works
Code of Practice Consultation
CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM – Page 1 of 16**

Annex A

CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM

PART 1 - Information about you

Name	NATIONAL JOINT UTILITIES GROUP
Address	111 Buckingham Palace Road London
Postcode	SW1W 0SR
email	
Company Name or Organisation (if applicable)	National Joint Utilities Group (NJUG)
Please tick one box from the list below that best describes you /your company or organisation.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Small to Medium Enterprise (up to 50 employees)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Large Company
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Representative Organisation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Trade Union
<input type="checkbox"/>	Interest Group
<input type="checkbox"/>	Local Government
<input type="checkbox"/>	Central Government
<input type="checkbox"/>	Police
<input type="checkbox"/>	Member of the public
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please describe):
If you are responding on behalf of an organisation or interest group how many members do you have and how did you obtain the views of your members: Members are:	
If you would like your response or personal details to be treated confidentially please explain why:	

**Amendment to the Safety at Street Works and Road Works
Code of Practice Consultation
CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM – Page 2 of 16**

PART 2 - Your Comments

<p>1. Are there any kinds of activities carried out as works for road purposes that are not covered by the revised Code? If so what additional requirements would you want to see covered?</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
---	--	------------------------------------

Please explain your reasons and add any additional topics on which you would wish to see further guidance :

There are a number of activities which could be classified as “works for road purposes” which are not adequately covered by the requirements of this code:-

Refuse/recycling collections – Currently no requirements for any signing when undertaking this activity but could be mentioned in respects to vehicle chevroning and beacons

Road Sweeping – Could be covered under mobile works but specific mention of the activity is not included.

Bus Shelter Construction/Cleansing - Could be covered under mobile works but specific mention of the activity is not included in respects to vehicle chevroning and beacons.

Skip / welfare/ storage unit placement – although covered in Highway Act, very rarely do we see adequate signing, lighting and guarding in these situations, some of which could be potentially dangerous.

Scaffolding adjacent or over Highway – although the requirements for signing, lighting and guarding this type of works may be covered in any licence granted for the erection of scaffolding it would be useful if it was also covered in this document.

<p>2. Do you agree that the Safety Code should be limited to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ single carriageway roads; and ▪ dual carriageways with a speed limit of 40 mph or less <p>If not what roads should the Safety Code cover and why?</p>	<p>YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>NO <input type="checkbox"/></p>
---	--	------------------------------------

**Amendment to the Safety at Street Works and Road Works
Code of Practice Consultation
CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM – Page 3 of 16**

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

NJUG agrees with the principle of restricting the Safety Code to these areas as it allows for the more detailed guidance on high speed roads to be referred out to Chapter 8 thus making the Safety Code less complicated, user friendly and focused upon the primary locations for the majority of road and street works. However guidance within this Code should be more specific as to where in Chapter 8 references to certain aspects can be found.

The draft code does not really cover the requirements of signing lighting and guarding on footpaths, pedestrian areas and bridleways. This could be simply amended to refer to all areas accessed by the public as a right of way. This could be inserted on page 1.

There is no Glossary of terms included with the draft as decided by the Working Party, this could clarify all the key definitions including Footway, Footpath etc.

<p>3. Are there any factors you would like to see included as part of the risk assessment? If so what are they and why do you consider they represent a risk?</p>	<p>YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>NO <input type="checkbox"/></p>
--	--	------------------------------------

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

NJUG would like to see more detail on the requirements for the site risk assessment. Many of our member organisations have generic risk assessment templates for the works which they undertake if they are to create a street works specific risk assessments or additions to their existing templates it would be useful to have a guidance list of recommended inclusions or even an example form.

The risk assessment should include the following elements currently not mentioned:-

- The proximity of other works promoters works
- The proximity of other temporary traffic management arrangements
- Weather conditions such as fog, heavy rain, high winds, snow and ice are not included in the guidance as areas to be considered as part of the risk assessment.

<p>4. Are there any factors that you consider irrelevant and would like to exclude? If so why?</p>	<p>YES <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
---	-------------------------------------	---

**Amendment to the Safety at Street Works and Road Works
Code of Practice Consultation
CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM – Page 4 of 16**

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

<p>5. Do you think that the Safety Code strikes the right balance between the needs of pedestrians, the needs of other road users, and the need for contractors to get the job done safely and efficiently? If not, why not, and what would you want to see instead?</p>	<p>YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
---	--	---

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

NJUG accepts that for the majority of the provisions made in this code the right balance between the needs of pedestrians, road users and other groups and the need to undertake works in the public highway in a safe and efficient manner have been met. The guidance provided in the revised code on site assessment will go a long way to ensuring that all road users are considered prior to works being undertaken.

However certain changes to the existing provisions are very likely to cause added disruption to certain road users due to complying with the needs of others. In particular the new revised provision for a minimum 1.2m of unobstructed footway. The existing code permits an absolute minimum of 1m. In many urban areas the existing footways are less than 1.2m wide which means that in almost every case a temporary footway of 1.2m + 500m safety zone will have to be constructed in the carriageway to take pedestrians affected by the works. This would normally not be an issue but in an urban environment with on street parking, bus and cycle lanes and limited road widths of often less than 4-5m this provision could extend the need for temporary road closures thus adding to disruption.

A more sensible approach would be to permit the existing absolute minimum of 1m only if a documented risk assessment declares that the maintenance of 1.2m is not practical. Any reduction to the absolute minimum should be clarified with the site manager or other competent person before being undertaken. It is far more sensible to use 1m of existing footway than to disrupt road traffic and put pedestrians into a temporary footway in the carriageway with all its potential hazards.

<p>6. Are you content with the proposed widths for lanes where shuttle working is employed? If not what evidence do you have to support alternatives?</p>	<p>YES <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
--	-------------------------------------	---

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

We have already outlined in 5 above some of our concerns regarding the restriction

~~Deleted: March~~

**Amendment to the Safety at Street Works and Road Works
Code of Practice Consultation
CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM – Page 5 of 16**

of usable widths on footways and carriageways. This new revised minimum lane width for single file traffic will only compound the issue of potential disruption further. Our members currently conduct over 2 million excavations in the public highway every year across the UK and it is a safe assumption that at least 65% of those would involve works which could potentially reduce the width of a carriageway below 3.25m through application of the revised widths for footways of 1.2m, or through occupation of the highway thus requiring a walkway in the carriageway. This will mean an increase in road closure applications and thus an increase in disruption.

NJUG does not object to these measures provided that their impact is adequately assessed and recognised after all a road closure ensures the safety of our operatives and minimises the exposure of road users to the works site.

The 6.75m minimum width for two way working could be seen as a nonsense as most urban residential and rural low class roads are already less than 6.75m in width meaning that some form of traffic control will be required on all occasions.

The changes in the minimum widths for shuttle working from the existing provision of 3.7m maximum to 3.0m absolute minimum to the revised provision of 3.5m maximum to 3.25m minimum will inevitably lead to an increase in the need for more disruptive measure of traffic control such as convoy working or in urban residential areas, road closures. The existing 3.0m absolute minimum could still be retained with authorisation from a manager or other competent person and the agreement of the HA.

Situations could also be arrived at where misinterpretation of the requirements under the revised code could lead to additional unnecessary disruption such as where a works vehicle is parked legally outside of the works but by doing so restricts the carriageway width to less than 3.25m as in many urban residential streets would a road closure than be required?

NJUG accepts that safety is paramount in all cases when works are undertaken in the highways and this is supported by the fact that safety is the number one statement of the NJUG VISION, however these considerations have to be balanced with the need to execute the works without causing unacceptable levels of disruption to the road user while complying with the needs of customers/clients and statutory obligations set by other regulation. These two changes should have been researched and included in the RIA.

<p>7. Are you content with the provisions for mobile works? If not what alternatives do you want to suggest and why?</p>	<p>YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>NO <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:</p> <p>NJUG feels that there needs to be more clarity as to the different requirements for Mobile Works and those required for Short Duration Works as the provisions seem to merge with no clear definitions.</p>		

Deleted: March

**Amendment to the Safety at Street Works and Road Works
Code of Practice Consultation
CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM – Page 6 of 16**

<p>8. Should the duration for short duration works be 90 minutes? If not what alternative maximum period would you consider appropriate and why?</p> <p>a) up to 30 minutes b) up to 60 minutes c) up to 120 minutes d) other – please specify</p>	<p>YES <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
--	-------------------------------------	---

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

NJUG feels that 90 minutes (1 ½ hours) is far too long to occupy the highway without undertaking the full provisions set out elsewhere in the code appropriate to the position of the works. This time period will lead to exploitation and potentially create unsafe sites for both operatives and road users.

The alternative we would propose is 45 minutes with criteria that in that time no breaking up of the street occurs. This will limit the works to those which can genuinely be completed in 45minutes such as:-

- Manhole / Chamber inspection or works
- Meter reading / change (without excavation)
- Instant pot hole repairs
- Tree cutting or felling
- Valve or switch operation
- Coring

The diagram on page 87 for short duration works is in direct conflict with other provisions in this code as it reduces the width of road to single file traffic without the use of any temporary traffic control.

<p>9. Are you content with the proposals for short duration works up to 90 minutes? If not what alternatives would you propose and why?</p>	<p>YES <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
--	-------------------------------------	---

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

SEE ANSWER TO QUESTION 8 -THIS QUESTION IS A DUPLICATION

**Amendment to the Safety at Street Works and Road Works
Code of Practice Consultation
CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM – Page 7 of 16**

10. Is the revised text sufficient on what needs to be done when works may take place near a level-crossing? If not, why not? What else would you like to see covered?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:</p> <p>NJUG felt the text was sufficient but this could be illustrated with a diagram. The Level crossing working group did provide diagrams for this section but these do not appear to have been included.</p>		

11. Are the revised requirements for works near tramways sufficient for the safety of operatives and road users? If not what else would you like to see covered and why?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:</p>		

12. Do you agree with the requirement for long-sleeve high-visibility jacket to be worn when operatives are working outside the work zone? If not why not?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:</p> <p>NJUG believes that the high-visibility clothing must be worn by operatives and other site personnel including visitors at all times and in all areas including outside of the safety and work zones and also within the work zone. To permit the non wearing of Hi-Vis in the work zone would encourage poor behavioural practices.</p>		

13. If you are a contractor or directly employ people working in the highway, do you already require them to wear Class 3 high visibility jackets?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:</p> <p>NJUG cannot comment on this question</p>		

**Amendment to the Safety at Street Works and Road Works
Code of Practice Consultation
CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM – Page 8 of 16**

14. Do you accept that the frequency of visits and the type of guarding used should reflect local factors at each site? If not, what alternative measures would you prefer to see and why?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:		

15. Do you agree that sites where no-one is working should be visited at least once every 24 hours to ensure that the site is safe? If not, what alternatives would you suggest? a) at least once every 24 hours; b) at least once a day; c) at least every 36 hours; d) other, please specify	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make: The question does not actually reflect what is in the provision. The revised code requires a site inspection on unattended sites once in every 24 hour period which is not the same as once every 24 hours. The latter could be easily misconstrued by some enforcement agencies that a site left at 1am on a Friday morning would have to be inspected at exactly 1am on the Saturday this is of course nonsense. The provisions in this code do not set out any guidance on how such an inspection should be recorded. The provisions in this code do not set out any guidance or requirements for the competency levels of the persons undertaking such an inspection. No reference is made to S67 of NRSWA 1991 in this regard		

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

16. Do you accept that in certain locations the risk may require the use of temporary backfill, or covers to minimise consequences should people enter the works zone? If not what other measures could be taken to minimise the consequences should someone, accidentally or deliberately, enter the works area? If your organisation has already identified different measures to reduce the risk, please provide examples and explain their impact.	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	-----------------------------

Deleted: March

**Amendment to the Safety at Street Works and Road Works
Code of Practice Consultation
CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM – Page 9 of 16**

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

NJUG accepts that certain works will require additional measures to prevent interaction with non works persons. The additional measures should be considered following a site / environment risk assessment as outlined in the revised code. Our members currently use a variety of additional protective measures including the following:-

- Temporary trench covers
- Upgraded fencing
- Additional site security
- Temporary reinstatement of works

The paragraph which reads:

*If an unattended site contains an open excavation that is within 2 metres of a temporary or permanent footway, then you **should** either:*

- put temporary covers over the excavation(see page 93); or
- provide an enhanced barrier around the excavation (see page 94).

Unless a site specific risk assessment shows that such additional protection is not justified.

NJUG believes that the “should” in this section should be replaced by the following wording :

If an unattended site contains an open excavation that is within 2 metres of a temporary or permanent footway, then consideration should be given to the use of either:

And the last paragraph (highlighted in bold text) should be taken out altogether as this can only be an opinion based perception of risk which differs between individuals also site conditions may change due to unforeseen circumstances.

<p>17. If your organisation works in the highway, do you have a record of the number of incidents where members of the public access, accidentally or deliberately, the work area at night or weekends? If so would you be willing to provide this to the Department for use in an aggregated and unattributed format?</p>	<p>YES <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>NO <input type="checkbox"/></p>
---	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

NJUG cannot comment on this question

**Amendment to the Safety at Street Works and Road Works
Code of Practice Consultation
CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM – Page 10 of 16**

<p>18. Do you agree that all works vehicles stopping on the highway or carrying out mobile works should be conspicuously marked with chevrons of red and yellow? If not what would you suggest is used instead to make vehicles conspicuous?</p>	<p>YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>NO <input type="checkbox"/></p>
---	--	------------------------------------

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

No mention is made of the colour of the vehicle itself. Chapter 8 provides the following which should be mirrored in this code as vehicles used on road works and street works are in reality the same as those used on high speed roads:-

O5.2 CONSPICUITY

O5.2.1 Any vehicle engaged in works on the highway not in an established works zone should be of a conspicuous colour.

O5.2.2 Subject to the specific requirements of the following sections, any works vehicles that are used to protect the workforce or form part of the signing of the works should be of conspicuous colour and appropriate marking. This is particularly important for that part of the vehicle visible to drivers and prescribed as part of any sign mounted on the vehicle.

O5.2.3 In addition, on high-speed roads, all vehicles stopping on the highway for works purposes or inspections shall be equipped with high visibility rear markings. High visibility rear markings should comprise either:

- a) signing to diagram 7403, or
- b) the alternative light arrow sign in accordance with Section O10.8, or
- c) chevron markings comprising alternate strips of fluorescent orange-red retroreflective material and fluorescent yellow non-retroreflective material, of not less than 150 mm width each, inclined at 45-60° to the horizontal and pointing upwards, or
- d) a solid block of fluorescent orange-red retroreflective material.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

The markings described in (c) and (d) above should cover as much of the rear-facing portion of the vehicle as possible without obscuring windows, vehicle lighting or registration plates.

Where the main body of the vehicle being used is not a recognised conspicuous colour (yellow or white) then the above markings should be supplemented by a high visibility fluorescent yellow retro-reflective strip, of not less than 50 mm wide, along the side of vehicle as a minimum.

O5.2.4 Red retro-reflective tape shall also be applied to all rear facing edges of open doors, guardrails and equipment lockers.

O5.2.5 Where rear facing high visibility markings may be obscured by any device mounted on the vehicle (e.g. lorry-mounted crash cushion (LMCC) or cone laying adaptation), at any time that the vehicle is stopped on a high-speed road, additional markings complying with paragraph O5.2.3 (c) or (d) shall be applied to any face of the device which is displayed to the rear and other road users.

O5.2.6 Works vehicles should be kept clean to maintain conspicuity.

O5.2.7 Motor vehicles with a maximum gross weight exceeding 7.5 tonnes and trailers with a maximum gross weight exceeding 3.5 tonnes must be fitted with rear markings in accordance with the Lighting Regulations

O5.2.8 Vehicles used for works purposes shall be identified by displaying to the rear the sign to diagram 7404 "HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE". The sign to diagram 7404 variant "MOTORWAY MAINTENANCE" may be used instead when working on motorways only.

Deleted: March

**Amendment to the Safety at Street Works and Road Works
Code of Practice Consultation
CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM – Page 11 of 16**

19. Do you agree that all vehicles should have either a roof bar or two independent amber lights all visible 360°? If not why not and what alternatives do you suggest?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
--	---	-----------------------------

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

There needs to be clarification that vehicles parked in legally defined parking zones/spaces and not forming or entering any part of the works are not required to have the lighting as defined in this provision. However it must be noted that agents, supervisors and project personnel will often visit sites and park their vehicles within the defined works site or in very close proximity and it is on these occasions that the warning beacons as defined in this provision must be used. If the vehicle is parked on a different street in a legal parking position there would be no requirement.

20. Do you agree with the introduction of a standard for the stability of barriers in wind resistance? If not how would you improve the ability of barriers to withstand weather conditions?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	-----------------------------

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

This provision is a sensible inclusion however it is one part of this code that at present cannot be fully complied with as manufacturers have not developed temporary site protection systems which on their own stand up to these wind forces. Development is currently being undertaken but additional ballast will be required on current systems.

NJUG would like to see a phased implementation of this requirement subject to the pace of product development as the addition of large quantities of bagged ballast product is not a satisfactory solution.

21. Do you agree with the conditions for the use of signs for temporary footway or carriageway delays? If not what conditions would you want to see for their use?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	-----------------------------

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

**Amendment to the Safety at Street Works and Road Works
Code of Practice Consultation
CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM – Page 12 of 16**

22. Do you agree that the current size and format should be retained? If not what alternative would you suggest and why?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:</p> <p>It should be affordable.</p> <p>The present A5 format should be retained.</p>		

23. Is the revised order of text helpful? What additional sections, if any, would you wish to see covered and why?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:</p> <p>The current CoP page 71 has a reminder page – this is an asset to the document and should be retained.</p> <p>A glossary of terms should be included to provide definitions for terms such as footway / footpath etc.</p> <p>An index of illustrations and diagrams would be useful to allow operatives to find the right diagram / illustration without wading through the whole document.</p>		

24. Which do you prefer a) plan view illustrations b) three-dimensional illustrations Why?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:</p> <p>a) The plan view is consistent with Chapter 8 and therefore preferable.</p>		

25. In the plan view illustrations do you prefer the signs to be represented so that they are correct for the reader, or to be orientated as they would be when placed in the highway (ie facing on-coming traffic)? a) reader b) road user Why?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	-----------------------------

Deleted: March

**Amendment to the Safety at Street Works and Road Works
Code of Practice Consultation
CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM – Page 13 of 16**

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

b) The road user situation so that diagrams align with site conditions

26. Are there any further changes you would want to see to increase the consistency between the Safety Code and Chapter 8 (2009 edition) documents? Is so what are they and why?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	-----------------------------

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

Some of the wording in the revised code could be mirrored with Chapter 8 where appropriate so that both documents read the same script for consistency.

As a participant in the principle working group for this revision we are still disappointed that the full scope of the opportunity to make one document from Chapter 8 and the this code was not fully explored. It seems nonsense to have two separate documents giving the same but often slightly different advice on the same subject. We would like to have seen Chapter 8 adopted as the Code of practice and this document changed to a field handbook.

27. To enable operatives, supervisors and inspectors to be competent in the revised Safety Code, especially those working on behalf of highway authorities, how long should the gap be between publishing the Code and it coming into force? a) 3 months b) 6 months c) other If other, what period would be appropriate? Why do you need this time?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
--	---	-----------------------------

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

b) 6 months - for the majority of the provisions.

Time is needed to ensure all operatives and contractor partners are trained. Job assessors, planners, supervisors, Managers all need to be trained.

Contract terms and conditions may also need to be changed.

Integrated works management systems and fields on mobile devices will require a software upgrade to include additional risk assessments.

Additional risk assessment requirements will mean recruitment for additional

**Amendment to the Safety at Street Works and Road Works
Code of Practice Consultation
CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM – Page 14 of 16**

resources.

Other provisions such as the barriers and other high cost changes should be phased in over a 12 month period.

Enforcement through prosecution should be restricted to after an initial 12 month period. This is to allow the provisions of this code to be fully embedded within organisations.

<p>28. If you need to purchase new equipment, would a longer lead time be helpful? If yes, how long would you require for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) long-sleeve high-visibility jackets <u>b)</u> beacons on works vehicles <u>c)</u> conspicuous markings on works vehicles <u>d)</u> use of barriers that when correctly erected meet the wind resistance standards 	<p>YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>NO <input type="checkbox"/></p>
--	--	------------------------------------

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

Having spoken to a number of our member organisations we have come to the following conclusions:

- a) 3 months from implementation
- b) 6-12months from implementation.
- c) 6-12months from implementation
- d) 6-12months from implementation

These timescales may vary according to our individual member's processes and procurement management.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

<p>29. How frequently do you:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) replace high-visibility jackets; <u>b)</u> replace or re-paint works vehicles; <u>c)</u> replace barriers; <u>d)</u> provide refresher training on signing, lighting and guarding to operatives? 	<p>YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>NO <input type="checkbox"/></p>
--	--	------------------------------------

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

Deleted: March

**Amendment to the Safety at Street Works and Road Works
Code of Practice Consultation
CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM – Page 15 of 16**

Having spoken to a number of our member organisations we have come to the following conclusions:

- a) As required on demand
- b) On average every 4 years
- c) As and when required
- d) Varies by company but most every 2 years or where identified as training need.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

30. Do you disagree with any of the assumptions in the impact assessment? If so why? Please provide justification for using alternative assumptions.	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	-----------------------------

Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:

No consideration has been made to work management system and mobile device software upgrades.

No consideration has been given to additional resources required to comply with the risk assessment if all sites need to be checked once in every 24 hour period including weekends and holidays.

No consideration has been given to the application of the revised minimum widths for footways and carriageways and their likely impact on traffic flows due to the potential need to increase the number of Temporary Traffic orders.

No consideration has been given to the cost impact of the potential increase in TTRO's both for the works promoters and the travelling public of UK PLC.

31. To assess the potential benefits more accurately, it would be helpful if you could share information to be used on an unattributable basis on any incidents in a recent 12-month period where:-	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. operatives have been injured by vehicles, including mobility scooters, cyclists or motorcyclists entering the works site (including works area and safety zone); b. traffic has entered the safety zone - broken down by whether the site was attended or unattended and whether drivers were uninjured, injured or killed; or c. pedestrians have entered a works site - 		

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: March

**Amendment to the Safety at Street Works and Road Works
Code of Practice Consultation
CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM – Page 16 of 16**

<p>broken down by whether the site was attended or unattended and whether pedestrians were uninjured, injured or killed;</p> <p>It would also be helpful to know the number of sites operated in that same 12 month period, so that the responses can be put into context.</p>		
<p>Please explain your reasons and add any additional comments you wish to make:</p> <p>NJUG cannot comment on this question</p>		

ADDITIONAL NOTE: THERE ARE A NUMBER OF ERRORS OR CLARIFICATIONS WHICH NJUG WOULD LIKE TO HIGHLIGHT:

1. There should be a Glossary of Terms to define terms such as Footway and Footpath TTRO etc
2. There should be a index of illustrations
3. Some sections are not clearly defined and appear to merge in to others such as Removing the works on page 80 has a bold title yet the section on Mobile works and short duration works which follows it does not and appears to merge into that section.
4. The use of countdown signs has not been covered in this code for works on high speed roads.
5. We are not sure why there is a diagram on page 29 for the use of two way portable signals as this has no relevance to the sections either side of it.
6. Page 89 refers to the minimum road width for single way traffic as being 3m this is now not correct it should be 3.25m
7. In the “Before you start” section there is no mention of the need to review weather conditions.
8. The diagrams on pages 41 & 49 refers to minimum widths for two way traffic flow being on page 62 this should be page 56.
9. Page 34 refers to a clearance of 3m from overhead tram electric cables this is contrary to the guidance given in GS 6 the electricity safety guidance which states a safe clearance is 6m.
10. The diagram on page 60 refers to minimum widths for two way traffic flow being on page 59 this should be page 56.
11. A diagram could be added as a example of a three way portable traffic signal set up.
12. Page 89 the paragraph headed “Short Duration traffic delays” refers to a minimum width of 3 metres this should be 3.25m.
13. Page 57 refers to “3.00 metres for one way traffic” this should be 3.25 metres.
14. The use of the word “engineer” on page 94 when determining the use of enhanced barriers is not appropriate it should be “supervisor of other competent person”.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: March