

Annex E – Consultation Questions

Response sheet

Information about you

Name	Salma Islam
Address	111 Buckingham Palace Road, London
Postcode	SW1W 0SR
Email	info@njug.org.uk
Company Name or Organisation (if applicable)	National Joint Utilities Group (NJUG)
Please delete as appropriate from the list below that best describes you/your company or organisation.	
No	Small to Medium Enterprise (up to 50 employees)
No	Large Company
Yes	Representative Organisation
No	Trade Union
No	Interest Group
No	Local Government
No	Central Government
No	Police
No	Member of the public
No	Other (please describe):
<p>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:</p> <p>NJUG has 51 members (utilities and utility contractors) and our members' views are obtained through internal consultation.</p>	

Consultation Questions

Please let us have your views on the specific issues listed below. Please also let us have any other comments.

Q1: Do you have any comments on the additional proposals contained in Annex C?	
Yes/No – please indicate as appropriate:	No
If you selected yes, please explain in detail below:	

Q2: Do you have any comments on proposals to allow portable pedestrian facilities?	
Yes/No – please indicate as appropriate:	No
If you selected yes, please explain in detail below:	

Q3: Have all superseded British and European Standards been captured?	
Yes/No – please indicate as appropriate:	No response
If not, which have been missed? Please explain below:	

Q4: Do the proposed savings for signs that have been withdrawn allow sufficient time to comply? (note: a 'saving' is the time period given in which to replace signs that have been withdrawn.)	
Yes/No – please indicate as appropriate:	No Response
If you selected no, please explain the difficulties this would create below:	

Q5: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Schedule 19 in respect of bus stop clearways, as detailed in paragraph 21 of part 1 of the consultation proposals?	
Yes/No – please indicate as appropriate:	No Response
If you selected no, please explain the difficulties the changes would create below:	

Q6: Do you agree with the proposed changes contained in the draft Traffic Signs (Temporary Obstructions) (Amendment) Regulations 2010?	
Yes/No – please indicate as appropriate:	No Response
If you selected no, please explain the difficulties the changes would create below:	

Q7: Do you have any comments on the proposed variation to allow the mounting height for permanent traffic signal heads to be increased where visibility of the signal heads is an issue?	
Yes/No – please indicate as appropriate:	No Response
If you selected yes, please explain in detail below:	

--

Q8: Are there signs other than those listed in the draft direction 44A that should be permitted to be affixed to traffic signals or mounted on signal posts?	
Yes/No – please indicate as appropriate:	No Response
If you selected yes, please explain in detail below:	

Q9: Do you have any comments on the proposed revision of direction 53 (placing of portable light signals prescribed by regulation 35)?	
Yes/No – please indicate as appropriate:	Yes
Please provide your comments below:	
<p>The proposed revision means that simple shuttle section portable signals will now require written approval (at present only multi way signals require approval – simple shuttle just notification). This conflicts with the requirements (statutory) in the Safety at Street Works and Road Works CoP (NRSWA s.65). It will also massively increase operational difficulty and delay in supplying utility customer services. There are no timescales in the draft Direction 53 for local authorities to respond to requests, and typically even simple requests can currently take days for some authorities to process, which contravenes maximum notice response times.</p> <p>If such a regime is to be introduced then there must be statutory rules. They should be in accord with the noticing/permit response timescales for the type of work involved, i.e. 2 days for Minor, 5 days for Standard Works etc. This will ensure consistency whilst offering sufficient time for impact analysis. Also, traffic management is an integral part of the impending Permit schemes and these same response timescales are mandatory for the granting of permits under those schemes.</p>	

Q10: Do you have any comments on the proposal to amend direction 46 to require portable signals to be mounted on posts coloured yellow or in a non-reflective metallic finish?	
Yes/No – please indicate as appropriate:	No
Please provide your comments below:	

--

Q11: Are the proposed changes helpful?	
Yes/No – please indicate as appropriate:	See above – Q9
Do you have any specific comments? It would help us if you could indicate which proposals you are commenting on by using the relevant paragraph number in Part 1 of the consultation proposals.	

Q12: Does the draft impact assessment cover all the costs and benefits arising from the proposals?	
Yes/No – please indicate as appropriate:	No
If not please provide supporting evidence below:	
<p>See answer to Q9 – the additional requirement for written approval of simple shuttle section portable signals will increase costs for both utilities / contractors and local authorities – whilst only small on an individual basis, the cumulative costs could be considerable. However, more importantly, the potential delays to the delivery of utility services could have significant cost implications for both utilities who are required to provide connections within certain prescribed timescales, and indeed to businesses waiting for their utility services.</p>	