

<b>Title:</b> <b>Impact Assessment for the Traffic Signs (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations and General Directions 2011</b>  <b>Lead department or agency:</b> Department for Transport <b>Other departments or agencies:</b> N/A	<b>Impact Assessment (IA)</b>
	<b>IA No:</b> DfT00082
	<b>Date:</b> 24/01/2011
	<b>Stage:</b> Final
	<b>Source of intervention:</b> Domestic
	<b>Type of measure:</b> Secondary legislation
<b>Contact for enquiries:</b> Richard Creese richard.creese@dft.gsi.gov.uk, 020 7944	

## Summary: Intervention and Options

### What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?

These amendment regulations comprise two broad issues

1 Highways Agency Traffic Officer Service - Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002 (TSRGD) need to be aligned with subsequent powers in the Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA) to give full effect to the Highways Agency Traffic Officer service. The inconsistency between the two regimes renders some of the Traffic Officers' functions under the TMA unlawful under TSRGD

2 Regulating commonly-used traffic signs emerging since 2002 - These changes present an opportunity to prescribe a number of commonly-used traffic signs currently needing special authorisation and to provide a series of updates to the regulations and directions.

### What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

The objectives of this statutory instrument are to:

- give full effect to the powers of the Highways Traffic Officer (HATO) service;
- provide highway authorities with a broader range of prescribed traffic signing options;
- align the regulations with current legislation, standards and practice; and,
- reduce central government involvement in the process of delivering local traffic management solutions – thereby reducing the associated costs and burdens to local and central government;.

### What policy options have been considered, including any alternatives to regulation? Please justify preferred option (further details in Evidence Base)

0) Do nothing.

1) Amend the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002.

Option 1 is the preferred option as it is the only option that will address the problem and policy objectives stated above within an acceptable timeframe.

**Will the policy be reviewed?** It will be reviewed. **If applicable, set review date:** 4/2013

**What is the basis for this review?** PIR. **If applicable, set sunset clause date:** Month/Year

**Are there arrangements in place that will allow a systematic collection of monitoring information for future policy review?**

Yes

**SELECT SIGNATORY Sign-off** For final proposal stage Impact Assessments:

*I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that (a) it represents a fair and reasonable view of the expected costs, benefits and impact of the policy, and (b) the benefits justify the costs.*

Signed by the responsible SELECT SIGNATORY: Mike Penning Date: 20/12/2011.

# Summary: Analysis and Evidence

# Policy Option 1

## Description:

The policy option is two-fold:

aligns TSRGD 2002 with TMA 2004, enabling Highways Agency Traffic Officers to execute certain functions, and regulates common signs emerging since 2002.

Price Base Year 2010	PV Base Year 2010	Time Period Years 10	Net Benefit (Present Value (PV)) (£m)		
			Low: 4,225	High: 4,433	Best Estimate: 4,329

COSTS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Cost (Present Value)
Low	N/A	N/A	N/A
High	N/A	N/A	N/A
Best Estimate	0.00	0.00	0.00

### Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

None - the changes are permissive and do not impose any new requirements on local authorities, utilities or manufacturers.

### Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

None

BENEFITS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Benefit (Present Value)
Low	N/A	0.508	4.225
High	N/A	0.533	4.433
Best Estimate	0.00	0.521	4.329

### Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

Benefits to the economy of these functions of the Traffic Officer Service = £0.433m annually, £3.601m total present value (best estimate)

Benefits of reduced burden on Local Authorities = £75-100k annually, best estimate £87.5k. Best estimate present value = £0.728m

### Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

None

<b>Key assumptions/sensitivities/risks</b>	<b>Discount rate (%)</b>
Risks	
Benefits of traffic officer service over or under stated, risk assessed as low	
Assumptions	
Number of engineer hours for sign authorisation as 8, for each special signs authorisation case. Assumption reasonable based on evidence	

Direct impact on business (Equivalent Annual) £m):	In scope of OIOO? Measure qualifies as
--	--

Costs: N/A	Benefits: N/A	Net: N/A	No	NA
------------	---------------	----------	----	----

## Enforcement, Implementation and Wider Impacts

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?		Great Britain			
From what date will the policy be implemented?		31/01/2011			
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?		Highway and traffic authorities			
What is the annual change in enforcement cost (£m)?		None			
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?		Yes			
Does implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?		N/A			
What is the CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent change in greenhouse gas emissions? (Million tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent)		Traded: None		Non-traded: None	
Does the proposal have an impact on competition?		No			
What proportion (%) of Total PV costs/benefits is directly attributable to primary legislation, if applicable?		Costs: N/A		Benefits: N/A	
Distribution of annual cost (%) by organisation size (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Micro 0	< 20 0	Small 0	Medium 0	Large 0
Are any of these organisations exempt?	No	No	No	No	No

## Specific Impact Tests: Checklist

Set out in the table below where information on any SITs undertaken as part of the analysis of the policy options can be found in the evidence base. For guidance on how to complete each test, double-click on the link for the guidance provided by the relevant department.

Please note this checklist is not intended to list each and every statutory consideration that departments should take into account when deciding which policy option to follow. It is the responsibility of departments to make sure that their duties are complied with.

Does your policy option/proposal have an impact on...?	Impact	Page ref within IA
<b>Statutory equality duties<sup>1</sup></b> <a href="#">Statutory Equality Duties Impact Test guidance</a>	No	
<b>Economic impacts</b>		
Competition <a href="#">Competition Assessment Impact Test guidance</a>	No	
Small firms <a href="#">Small Firms Impact Test guidance</a>	No	
<b>Environmental impacts</b>		
Greenhouse gas assessment <a href="#">Greenhouse Gas Assessment Impact Test guidance</a>	No	
Wider environmental issues <a href="#">Wider Environmental Issues Impact Test guidance</a>	No	
<b>Social impacts</b>		
Health and well-being <a href="#">Health and Well-being Impact Test guidance</a>	No	
Human rights <a href="#">Human Rights Impact Test guidance</a>	No	
Justice system <a href="#">Justice Impact Test guidance</a>	No	
Rural proofing <a href="#">Rural Proofing Impact Test guidance</a>	No	
<b>Sustainable development</b> <a href="#">Sustainable Development Impact Test guidance</a>	No	

<sup>1</sup> Public bodies including Whitehall departments are required to consider the impact of their policies and measures on race, disability and gender. It is intended to extend this consideration requirement under the Equality Act 2010 to cover age, sexual orientation, religion or belief and gender reassignment from April 2011 (to Great Britain only). The Toolkit provides advice on statutory equality duties for public authorities with a remit in Northern Ireland.

## Evidence Base (for summary sheets) – Notes

Use this space to set out the relevant references, evidence, analysis and detailed narrative from which you have generated your policy options or proposal. Please fill in **References** section.

### References

Include the links to relevant legislation and publications, such as public impact assessments of earlier stages (e.g. Consultation, Final, Enactment) and those of the matching IN or OUTs measures.

No.	Legislation or publication
1	<a href="http://www.dft.gov.uk/consultations/archive/2009/trafficsignsamendmentregs/">http://www.dft.gov.uk/consultations/archive/2009/trafficsignsamendmentregs/</a>
2	<a href="http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si2002/20023113.htm">http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si2002/20023113.htm</a>
3	<a href="http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/roads/tss/tsmanual/">http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/roads/tss/tsmanual/</a>
4	

+ Add another row

### Evidence Base

Ensure that the information in this section provides clear evidence of the information provided in the summary pages of this form (recommended maximum of 30 pages). Complete the **Annual profile of monetised costs and benefits** (transition and recurring) below over the life of the preferred policy (use the spreadsheet attached if the period is longer than 10 years).

The spreadsheet also contains an emission changes table that you will need to fill in if your measure has an impact on greenhouse gas emissions.

#### Annual profile of monetised costs and benefits\* - (£m) constant prices

	Y <sub>0</sub>	Y <sub>1</sub>	Y <sub>2</sub>	Y <sub>3</sub>	Y <sub>4</sub>	Y <sub>5</sub>	Y <sub>6</sub>	Y <sub>7</sub>	Y <sub>8</sub>	Y <sub>9</sub>
<b>Transition costs</b>	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Annual recurring cost</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total annual costs</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Transition benefits</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Annual recurring benefits</b>	0	0.521	0.521	0.521	0.521	0.521	0.521	0.521	0.521	0.521
<b>Total annual benefits</b>	0	0.521	0.521	0.521	0.521	0.521	0.521	0.521	0.521	0.521

\* For non-monetised benefits please see summary pages and main evidence base section



Microsoft Office  
Excel Worksheet

# Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

## Background

### *Highways Agency Traffic Officer Service*

The amendments to align the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002 (TSRGD) with the powers in the TMA are urgent, in order for the traffic officer service to give full support to the emergency services in minimising traffic disruption in the event of an incident. The inconsistency between the two regimes renders some of the Traffic Officers' functions under the Traffic Management Act 2004 (TMA) unlawful under TSRGD

Provisions contained in the TMA gave powers to the Highways Agency's uniformed traffic officers to carry out traffic management duties in support of the emergency services in the event of an incident on the Highways Agency's network (the Highways Agency is an executive agency of the Department for Transport). This network includes the motorways and all-purpose trunk roads in England. These duties include stopping and directing traffic and closing lanes and carriageways. These enabling powers were introduced subsequent to the current TSRGD, which therefore requires some consequential changes to enable traffic officers to carry out the following functions:

- to direct traffic to cross double white lines,
- to stop at green traffic signals, and;
- to pass under gantry mounted lane closure signals over live carriageways (these signals appear as a red 'X')

The proposed amendments would give Highways Agency Traffic Officers the same powers as uniformed police officers and traffic wardens to carry out these functions as intended under the TMA.

### ***Traffic Signs Authorisations***

Since the introduction of TSRGD, a number of new traffic signs have come into common use, reflecting emerging new traffic management methods. Regulations cannot keep pace with these changes. The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 permits the authorisation of non-standard signs by the Secretary of State in situations where the local need is not met by the Regulations.

## **Rationale for intervention**

### ***Highways Agency Traffic Officer Service***

Not aligning the TSRGD with the provisions in the TMA 2004 means that currently traffic officers are performing best practice functions which are technically unlawful. Aligning these will enable traffic officers to lawfully use these functions fully and as intended to enable the full benefits of the functions to be realised.

### ***Traffic Signs Authorisations***

By virtue of section 64 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (the Parent Act) traffic signs for use in Great Britain (including traffic signals and road markings) must either conform to the standards set mainly in the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002 (TSRGD) or be specially authorised by the Secretary of State (or appropriate devolved administration); authorisation would occur, for instance, where a local need is not met by the regulations.

Traffic signs are strictly regulated to ensure national consistency of traffic sign design and use, to maximise road user understanding. Clear and consistent traffic signing and signalling plays a key role in achieving effective traffic management, while contributing to increased road safety.

As traffic signals are regulated by TSRGD, which were made by way of secondary legislation, the necessary changes must be made by further secondary legislation.

## Policy Options Considered

Two policy options are appraised in this version of the Impact Assessment::

- 0) Do nothing
- 1) Amend the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002.

Option 1 is the preferred option as it is the only option that will address the problem and policy objectives stated above within an acceptable timeframe.

The scope of this final Impact Assessment has changed since that included in the September 2009 public consultation. This is in most part due to the decision, in light of consultation comments received, to withdraw the consultation proposal to phase out - by April 2014 - those traffic signs conveying imperial-only vehicle height and width limits at low and narrow bridges. Highway authorities will retain the option to use the imperial-only or dual-unit alternatives currently prescribed. The economic analysis pertained to that proposal has been removed.

Other changes have been made to the S.I. in light of comments made in consultation, although there **are no** associated cost and benefit implications. These are set out in **Annex 2**.

## Costs and Benefits of Options

### Benefits

#### *Highways Agency Traffic Officers*

We consider that the additional powers will enable Highways Agency Traffic Officers to be more efficient in carrying out their primary duties. This will contribute to reduced congestion and improve journey time reliability. In April 2007 HA provided a 5th update to Ministers and DfT "Traffic Officer Service Rollout in England – April 2007 Progress Report" on performance and benefits realisation.

The annual estimated benefits were reported as follows:

Benefit	Estimated value (p/a)
Reduced incident related congestion	£27.2m
More reliable journeys	£13.6m
Fewer injuries arising from debris incidents	£3.2m
Fewer secondary incidents	£6.5m
Freed up police time	£29.9m
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£80.4m</b>

A review of the Traffic Officer Service was undertaken by DfT in 2009.

The Highways Agency estimates that these proposals would constitute 0.5% of traffic officers' work and therefore overall these proposals would constitute 0.5% of the total TO benefits shown in the table above. This represents a best estimate, and this is conservative. It is not possible to accurately predict the occurrence and nature of incidents to which the Traffic Officers would respond on the network where the proposed changes would impact. However, on parts of the network where operations are currently precluded by TSRGD the change is significant.

Taking 0.5% of total annual benefits of £8.04m equals £0.402m annually at 2007 prices, or **£0.433m** in 2010 prices. The present value of these benefits is **£3.601m**.

The proposed amendments do not confer any new underlying powers on Traffic Officers. Instead they ensure that the TSRGD does not obstruct Traffic Officers from carrying out powers



they already have under the TMA. The cost neutral estimate is based on the Traffic Officers already on-road carrying out those incident management functions currently permitted. Traffic Officers would still be reacting to the same incident types across the network, but where currently constrained by the TSRGD, would not be able to resolve some incidents without the presence of a police constable or traffic warden. Having the power to pass beneath lane closure 'red x' traffic signals (for example) would enable Traffic Officers to access and resolve incident scenes quicker thereby improving journey reliability measures.

As the current TSRGD prevents Traffic Officers from directing traffic over continuous white lines, in affect they cannot currently operate on some parts of the All Purpose Trunk Road Network with undivided or single carriageways. This includes a number of the routes that the Highways Agency has been requested to provide Traffic Officer operations in support of the 2012 Olympics. The proposals would also negate the associated costs of requiring third party presence. The cost of training Traffic Officers in the new functions will be mitigated by building this requirement into existing training provision for new entrants, or refresher element.

### ***Traffic Signs Authorisations***

By prescribing the additional signs as proposed, it is estimated that 220 fewer authorisation requests would be received from local authorities each year. (This is based on analysis of recent authorisation trends, by sign category, contained in the department's traffic sign authorisation database.)

Having consulted with relevant stakeholders, the cost of preparing an application, and addressing any actions arising, is estimated to be between £350 and £450, based on 8 hours of an engineer's time. The department therefore considers that a reasonable range of the financial saving to local authorities is **between £75,000 and £100,000 per year, with a best estimate of £87,500 per year.**

The above estimate does not include the network management benefits associated with speedier scheme implementation, by removing the authorisation process for these signs. Annually, the Department receives in excess of 500 applications in total - with a corresponding KPI turnaround target of 3 months. These benefits are more difficult to quantify.

Not taking forward these changes would mean that local authorities would need to continue applying for authorisation for non-prescribed traffic signs. Departmental analysis has shown that many applications for these (now) commonly used traffic signs require little or no changes – indicating that highway authorities intend to use these signs in line with best practice. Therefore, in respect of these signs, the analysis would suggest that the authorisation process is adding an unnecessary burden.

In addition, capturing these traffic signs in amendment regulations could reduce the timescales involved in delivering new traffic management schemes - thus delivering the benefits of the scheme earlier.

Combined TO powers and sign authorisation annual and present value benefits equal; (Note: present values are calculated from 2011, the year in which these amendments come into force, to a base year of 2010)

<b>Annual impacts, 2010 nominal prices</b>	<b>Low (£m pa)</b>	<b>Best Estimate £m pa)</b>	<b>High (£m pa)</b>
Traffic Officers	0.433	0.433	0.433
Sign authorisation	0.075	0.0875	0.100
Total	0.508	0.5205	0.533
<b>Appraisal period impact 2010-2019</b>	<b>Low (£m pv)</b>	<b>Best Estimate (£m pv)</b>	<b>High (£m pv)</b>

Traffic Officers	3.601	3.601	3.601
Sign authorisation	0.624	0.728	0.832
Total	4.225	4.329	4.433

## **Costs**

### ***Highways Agency Traffic Officer powers***

The new Highways Agency Traffic Officer powers will not result in any additional costs being incurred as the Highways Agency intends these functions to be carried out by the existing officers who are trained and experienced in using such functions.

### ***Traffic Signs Authorisations***

The department considers that prescribing more signs and variants in TSRGD will not lead to any additional costs to authorities. Scheme designers have to use the most appropriate sign when developing a scheme and frequently require special authorisation to use non-prescribed signs. The additional signs and permitted variants mean that many signs previously requiring special authorisation would be prescribed and may be used by authorities without reference to the department.

### ***Risks and Assumptions***

The risk for the do-nothing option is that not aligning TSRGD with the subsequent provisions of the Traffic Management Act 2004 would obstruct traffic officers' ability to lawfully direct traffic in the event of an incident on the road network - e.g. directing traffic to pass under a gantry-mounted red 'X' lane closure sign. These functions are essential and must be carried out lawfully,

It is considered that there are no risks to the costs of this proposal. Existing traffic officers are already aware of these powers and are trained to use them in practice. This proposal allows their work to be lawful.

There is a risk that estimates of traffic officer service benefits could be over or under estimated, however this risk is assessed as low because of an in-house assessment performed in 2009 by DfT economists which concluded that the value estimated of traffic officer service was robust.

There is an assumption that traffic sign authorisation takes up 8 hours of an engineers time, this assumption is assessed as reasonable given evidence from those completing the authorisations.

### **Summary (preferred option)**

**The preferred option is the do-something option (policy option 1).** This option would enable Traffic Officers to lawfully carry out functions which are already considered good practice. A study considered robust by DfT has shown that the TO service provides benefits to the economy, and making these functions lawful would ensure they are carried out fully and to a standard that enables the benefits to be realised. These can be achieved at no additional cost to the TO service above business as usual.

These amendments also allow for a burden on Local Authorities to be reduced (albeit a small reduction in burdens). This will be through increasing the coverage of road sign which do not require authorisation by DfT and therefore do not require an application to be made for use.



## **Wider Impacts**

### ***Enforcement, sanctions and monitoring***

There is no formal enforcement, sanctions or monitoring of traffic signs in Great Britain.

The Department for Transport provides the legal framework for traffic signing, however implementation of the regulations remains the responsibility of the appropriate highway authority; and it will be for highway authorities to monitor their own performance.

### ***Competition Assessment***

The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 requires traffic signs to be of the size, colour and type specified in regulations, mainly TSRGD. These regulations do not preclude any manufacturer from producing compliant traffic signs. Therefore we do not consider that there are any competition issues arising from the proposals.

### ***Small Firms Impact Test***

These changes do not introduce any new requirements - they are enabling changes only. Therefore there will be no compulsory costs to small firms.

Representatives of those small businesses with a professional interest in traffic signing were consulted as part of the 12-week public consultation on the draft proposals.

### ***Legal Aid***

The proposed amendment regulations will not introduce new criminal sanctions or civil penalties.

### ***Sustainable development***

The Department does not consider that the proposed amendment regulations will have an impact on sustainable development principles.

### ***Carbon Assessment***

The Department does not consider that these regulations will affect the level of greenhouse gas emissions.

### ***Other Environment***

The Department does not consider these regulations will have an adverse environmental impact.

### ***Health Impact Assessment***

The Department considers that the proposals relating to the Highways Agency Traffic Officer Service may improve the level of road safety and therefore the health of road users.

### ***Race Equality***

There will be no impact on race equality.

### ***Disability Equality***

Under the Disability Discrimination Act 1995, (and the Equalities Act 2010) it is unlawful for a public authority to discriminate against a disabled person in carrying out its functions. We do not consider that

these regulations will discriminate against disabled people as the purpose of traffic signs is to provide the requisite information in order for them (and others) safely to navigate their journey. These are no disability related issues in these proposals.

### ***Gender Equality***

There will be no impact on gender equality.

### ***Human Rights***

There will be no impact on human rights.

### ***Rural proofing***

The proposed amendment regulations should not impact on rural communities unfairly.

## Annexes

Annex 1 should be used to set out the Post Implementation Review Plan as detailed below. Further annexes may be added where the Specific Impact Tests yield information relevant to an overall understanding of policy options.

### Annex 1: Post Implementation Review (PIR) Plan

A PIR should be undertaken, usually three to five years after implementation of the policy, but exceptionally a longer period may be more appropriate. If the policy is subject to a sunset clause, the review should be carried out sufficiently early that any renewal or amendment to legislation can be enacted before the expiry date. A PIR should examine the extent to which the implemented regulations have achieved their objectives, assess their costs and benefits and identify whether they are having any unintended consequences. Please set out the PIR Plan as detailed below. If there is no plan to do a PIR please provide reasons below.

<p><b>Basis of the review:</b> [The basis of the review could be statutory (forming part of the legislation), i.e. a sunset clause or a duty to review, or there could be a political commitment to review (PIR)];</p> <p>These amendment regulations form part of a wider ranging review of the traffic signing system. The review will complete in March 2011, but it is already known that it will result in significant revisions to TSRGD 2002. Every measure in the regulations - including these amendment regulations - will be reviewed. We expect the new regulations will come into force in 3 - 5 years time.</p>
<p><b>Review objective:</b> [Is it intended as a proportionate check that regulation is operating as expected to tackle the problem of concern?; or as a wider exploration of the policy approach taken?; or as a link from policy objective to outcome?]</p> <p>See above</p>
<p><b>Review approach and rationale:</b> [e.g. describe here the review approach (in-depth evaluation, scope review of monitoring data, scan of stakeholder views, etc.) and the rationale that made choosing such an approach]</p> <p>See above</p>
<p><b>Baseline:</b> [The current (baseline) position against which the change introduced by the legislation can be measured]</p> <p>See above</p>
<p><b>Success criteria:</b> [Criteria showing achievement of the policy objectives as set out in the final impact assessment; criteria for modifying or replacing the policy if it does not achieve its objectives]</p> <p>See above</p>
<p><b>Monitoring information arrangements:</b> [Provide further details of the planned/existing arrangements in place that will allow a systematic collection of monitoring information for future policy review]</p> <p>See above</p>
<p><b>Reasons for not planning a review:</b> [If there is no plan to do a PIR please provide reasons here]</p> <p>N/A</p>

## Annex 2: Traffic Signs Amendment Regulations 2011 - post consultation changes.

Amendment of:	Explanation of change
Regulation 4 Definition of Signal Controlled Pedestrian Facility	Deleted as now appears in separate S.I.
Regulation 10 Application of Section 36 Road traffic Act. Paragraph 1(f)	Additional yellow box marking diagrams 1044.1 and 1044.2 have been added. The offence applies equally to these new diagrams.
Regulation 17(10). Weight limit unit indicator.	Currently the unit of measurement for tonnes may be represented with either an uppercase "T", or a lowercase "t". Consultation responses highlighted that - as the old 'imperial' or 'long ton' is no longer in use in the UK - the correct lowercase "t", should be used. In response to this, Regulation 17(10) is to be removed and diagrams will now show the lower case "t". There will be no time limit applied to the change, and a 3-month 'grace' period will be applied from the regulations coming into force to allow for ongoing signing schemes.
Regulation 22 Buses	Amended to include reference to upright signs to diagram 974 and 975 contained in Schedule 19 Part I.
Regulation 23 Bus lanes.	Diagrams 958A and 959A added (which include motorcycle symbol). All regulations and Directions have been applied equally to these signs as to Diagrams 598 and 959.
Regulation 29	New yellow box marking diagrams 1044.1 and 1044.2 have been added.
Regulations 33 and 35	Deleted as now appears in separate S.I
Regulation 43 Diagram 1001.2A - Advance STOP lines for cyclists.	The consultation S.I. erroneously treated diagram 1001.2A in the same way as diagram 1001.2 insofar as reference was made to a 'cycle lane' for diagram 1001.2A - whereas this marking is intended for use where space constraints prevent the placing of marking 1001.2. Regulation 43 now defines the point of entry as a "cycle entry" thus distinguishing diagram 1001.2A from diagram 1001.2.
Regulation 47 Light signals at signal-controlled pedestrian facilities	Deleted as now appears in separate S.I
Regulation 54 Flashing beacons.	Amending regulation 25(1)(a). This provision was unnecessary as diagram 7009.1 is a sub plate that can only be placed with 7009 - which is listed in existing regulation 54.
Regulation 55. Road danger lamps.	The present regulation 55 specifies the various performance characteristics of those lamps that may be placed on roads in the UK with reference to BS 3143. The amended regulation 55 specifies the same performance requirements, but relates them to classes within the new (harmonized European) Standard, BS EN 12352:2006. The reason we are making the change, therefore, is that it is actually impossible to comply with the current regulation because the old national standard no longer exists, having been withdrawn in line with CEN requirements. By specifying our performance requirements against the new (harmonized European) one, we are perpetuating those same requirements, but removing what would arguably constitute a barrier to trade. The result, in terms of the product on the ground, will be the same as in 2002. Only the method of delivery of the specification has been updated. The above does not, in any way, alter the provision in terms of scope, requirements or restrictiveness.
Regulation 56. Cones, delineators and cylinders.	The present regulation 56 specifies the various performance characteristics of cones and cylinders with reference to BS 873. The amended regulation specifies the same characteristics, but relates them to classes within the new (harmonised European) BS EN 13422. The reason we are making the change, therefore, is that it is actually impossible to comply with the current regulation because the old national standard no longer exists, having been withdrawn in line with CEN requirements. By specifying our performance requirements against the new (harmonized European) one, we are perpetuating those same requirements, but removing what would arguably constitute a barrier to trade. The result, in terms of the product on the ground, will be the same as in 2002. Only the method of delivery of the specification has been updated. Delineators are not covered by a European Standard, so our requirements are simply set out in full as in 2002. The above does not, in any way, alter the provision in terms of scope, requirements or restrictiveness.

Regulation 58 Variable message signs - colour of legend.	It was brought to our attention that the regulations were more prescriptive than intended in respect of the permitted colour of VMS legends in Schedules 11 and 15 - which only permit white. New paragraph 2A permits Schedule 11 signs (with the exception of diagram 6031.1) or Schedule 15 legends to be displayed in white, off-white or yellow.
Diagram 530A - New dual-unit height limit warning sign	As an alternative to diagram 530, a new diagram has been designed, following consultation, incorporating both imperial and metric units of measurement within one sign. This gives authorities the option of placing a single warning triangle instead of two - as currently prescribed - when replacing signs to diagram 530. This design has also been incorporated into new diagrams 532.2A, 532.3A and 818.5.
Schedule 12 Part III Lane closures and contra flow working at road works	The yellow areas of diagrams marked with double asterisks may now be fluorescent
Diagram 629.1 - vehicle length limit.	For clarity, the diagram has been amended to illustrate both imperial and metric units. Schedule 16 item 2 it therefore no longer necessary.
New Diagrams: 2601.1A, 2602.1A and 2602.1C - cycle journey times.	The sign designs have been refined for clarity. Separate signs are now included which allow distance and times to be represented on cycle and pedestrian signs - but not for both - as it is not considered feasible to include journey times for both pedestrians and cyclists on one sign.
Diagram 2711.1 minimum safety requirements for tunnels - the shortest escape route.	Schedule 16 item 6 - new para. 4 makes clear the appropriate unit of distance.
Diagram 818.3 Nature and distance to prohibition	It is no longer appropriate to include Schedule 16, item 11 as the permitted variant requires the addition of an arrow when "ahead" is omitted. Arrows are therefore no longer permitted for inclusion. The permitted variants have also been amended for clarification.
Diagrams 629 and 629.2 width and height limits	The decision has been taken to withdraw the proposal to phase out these signs within 4 years. These diagrams are therefore to remain.
Schedule 16 item 34. Reference to Diagram 2310.1	The erroneous reference to diagram 2310.2 has been replaced as this diagram does not have a wheelchair symbol. Instead now refers to diagram 814.2.
Schedule 16 item 38 Diagram 962.2 Advisory contra flow cycle facilities	Advisory contra flow cycling sign was only ever intended for use 24/7. Therefore this reference to time limits has been removed.
Schedule 16 Items 37A, 39A and 47	Previously included in Schedule 16 have been removed. Instead, the permitted variants to diagrams 832.1B and 832.2B, and 660.8 have been included in item 4 of the tables below the diagrams.
Diagram 3000	Moved from previous item 37A to comply with existing item numbering convention.
Schedule 2 Diagrams 622.1A, 626.2A, 640.2A, 665 and 666. Schedule 7 Diagram 2108. Schedule 12 Diagram 7282.	Currently the unit of measurement for tonnes may be represented with either an uppercase "T", or a lowercase "t". Consultation responses highlighted that - as the old 'imperial' or 'long ton' is no longer in use in the UK - the correct lowercase "t", should be used. In response to this, Regulation 17(10) has been removed and diagrams will now show the lower case "t". There will be no time limit applied to the change and, thus, no associated costs.
Diagram 670 - Speed limits	The reference to 'national speed limit' has been removed from the caption.
Diagram 2716 Temporary diversion routes	The permitted variants have been expanded to allow diversion information relating to junction numbers.
Diagram 7014.1 - Temporary signs for temporary or permanent reductions in bridge heights.	In consultation, diagram 7014.1 had been placed under Schedule 17 item 1 in error. The lighting requirements have been changed to accord with established Bridge Strike Prevention Group protocols. On roads 40mph or more it may be prudent to illuminate it so we want this option to be open to the authority's judgement. Additionally, where it is absolutely necessary to be lit is at a permanent reduction in clearance - either at a bridge that is already signed or where there is no height limit signing - permanent height reductions seldom happen, so it should not be too onerous to make it mandatory for the signs to be lit.

Schedule 19 Part I - Bus stop clearways	The consultation draft sought to permit local <u>and</u> non-local bus services to use bus stop clearways, provided they operated to a published timetable. The consensus in consultation was in favour of allowing highway authorities complete discretion over which categories of bus services they allow to use bus stop clearways without the proposed timetable caveat. In light of the consultation responses Schedule 19 has been changed to allow any bus service to use bus stop clearways when the accompanying upright sign shown in diagram 974 or 975 indicates "except buses", and for local buses only when those signs are varied to "except local buses".
Box junction markings  Schedule 19 Part II Regulation 29 Directions 18(3) and 35	The existing prescribed uses for box junction markings have been represented in separate diagrams for clarity (diagrams 1043 and 1044). Provision has also been made to allow the markings to be placed adjacent to the vehicular entrance to the premises of a police, fire or ambulance station. An additional 5-sided box marking (diagram 1044.1) has also been added for use at any arm of a signalised gyratory so long as that arm is controlled by full-time light signals - irrespective of whether the other arms of the gyratory are not signalised. This marking has been authorised previously. New Diagram 1044.2 may be placed at location where the carriageway width is below 4.5 metres wide at its narrowest point. This marking must be 'book ended' with signs to Diagrams 615 and 811. Specific exemptions from the prohibition have been included in respect of vehicles being used for emergency service purposes.
Regulation 3 Savings. Height and width limit signs.	It has been decided to withdraw the proposal to phase out of the imperial only vehicle height and width limit signs. The proposed 4-year exception to the savings has therefore been removed.
Direction 3 Restricted parking Zones	Diagram 1020 was omitted in error. This is now included.
Direction 9 - Beginning of speed limits	The existing paragraph 5(b) has been replaced to correct an unintended consequence of the current provision - which requires a speed limit repeater to be placed on the other road at a T-junction within 100 yards - and in <u>both</u> directions. This creates the nonsensical situation of requiring a repeater to the right of a T-junction even where traffic may only turn left (i.e. onto a dual carriageway)
Direction 11 - Repeater signs	Some consultation responses highlighted that the proposals did not fully achieve the stated objective of clarifying the appropriate intervals at which to place repeater signs, and thresholds below which specified signs need not be placed. This has been redrafted to address this.
Direction 13(3) Signs placed on specified types of road	Conditions of use of new diagrams 2602.1A, 2602.1B and 2602.1C applied equally to those for existing Diagram 2602.1.
Direction 17 Diagram 960.2 - Advisory Contra flow cycle facilities.	Amended to remove the erroneous requirement in consultation to use diagram 1004 with the 960.2 marking - the only marking we want to require with 960.2 is diagram 1057. Additionally, it was not the intention to allow un-segregated contra-flow cycling on high speed roads - therefore diagram 1004.1 is not appropriate for use with 960.2. Contra flow cycling facilities must always operate at all times - i.e. with no time variations. Diagram 960.2 is therefore removed Schedule 16 item 38.
Direction 18 (1) road markings to be placed with other markings	New item 10A added requiring Diagram 1050 to be placed only in conjunction with Diagram 1049.
Direction 21 Plates to be placed with signs	New Diagram 530A has been added.
Direction 25 Permit parking areas.	In light of consultation responses, direction 25(l) has been amended to allow yellow line markings shown in diagrams 1017, 1018.1, 1019 and 1020.1 to be placed within a permit parking area.
Schedule 2 Diagram 660.8, 660.9, Schedule 6 Diagrams 1028.3, 1028.4, 1032 and 1033 - Car clubs and electric vehicle recharging points	In response to consultation comments from the sign manufacturing industry, diagram 660.8 has been changed to incorporate the car club symbol as standard blue - thus reducing production costs. Direction 24 and 25 have been changed to allow CAR CLUB and ELECTRIC VEHICLES legend to be abbreviated when indicating just one parking space.
Direction 38A - road danger lamps	New direction to clarify the appropriate placing of road danger lamps.



Direction 41 - Mounting of certain signs on internally illumination or self righting retroreflective bollards	Has been changed to correct some errors identified in consultation. In order to ensure that our intentions are clear, and to correct the erroneous text, the new paragraph (3A) has been amended to reiterate the illumination requirements of the signs so mounted and to correct the supplementary text in respect of self-righting retroreflective bollards
Direction 42 - Backing of signs.	Consultation responses have pointed out the need to: (a) replace the out-of-date reference to BS 873 and (b) make it clear that the requirements in respect of the colour of sign backs extend to the background of any labels attached to the sign. The current wording, which permits lettering to be applied to the back of a sign for various purposes, is being misinterpreted by some manufacturers insofar as they have been using stickers with a background that contrast with the back of the sign. This is to the detriment of both road safety and the environment.
Direction 44A Placing of traffic signs on traffic signal posts.	Has been changed to allow certain signs to be mounted directly onto the signal post, but only when they face the traffic to which they relate.
Direction 46 Portable pedestrian facility signal posts	In light of consultation responses, it has been decided to withdraw this proposal.
Direction 57 - Studs	Has been changed to correct some errors identified in consultation. It has been pointed out that the references to British/European Standards are out of date.