

EAPC Consultation

Annex C – Response Form

Title: Mr

Name: Kevin Clinton

Organisation (if applicable):

The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RoSPA)

Address: Edgbaston Park,
353 Bristol Road
Birmingham

Postcode: B5 7ST

E-mail address: kclinton@rospa.com

Date: 22 March 2010

Please note:

The Department will prepare and publish a summary of all the responses to this consultation letter. Copies of individual responses may also be made available to anyone that requests them.

I am/~~am not~~* content for a copy of my response to be made available if requested. Please note that if you ask for your response to be kept confidential this will only be possible if it is consistent with our obligations under the Freedom of Information Act 2000

*please delete as appropriate

Your answers to the following questions will help us to better understand the issues and decide the best way forward. **The options referenced in the questions are fully explained in the impact assessment included with this consultation** and we will use the replies to develop these options and improve our understanding of the costs, benefits and risks.

Q1. Do you support raising the continuous rated power of the electric motor for bicycles and tandems from 0.2 kilowatts to 0.25 kilowatts (Options 2 & 3)?

Note. There are no plans to amend the GB maximum speed at which electrical assistance may be provided (15 mph).

Yes
No,

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

RoSPA thinks that it is sensible to harmonise the GB regulations with the European Standard for Electrically Assisted Pedal Cycles (EAPCs). This would be clearer for manufacturers, retailers, consumers and those responsible for enforcement. It would also provide the trade and financial benefits of being able to use the same motors on both European and British EAPCs.

We do believe this proposal would create any safety problems.

Q2. Should the current weight limit of 40 kg for bicycles and tandems be removed (Option 2 & 3)?

Yes
No

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

This would enable manufacturers to produce the same bicycles and tandems for the GB and European markets.

Q3. Should the current unladen weight limit of 60 kg for electrically assisted tricycles be retained (Option 2)?

Note. Tricycles have the potential to be used for carrying loads. We believe that there is a safety justification for limiting the size and therefore load capacity of such vehicles. A weight limit provides a simple and easily enforceable method to ensure safety.

Heavier electric tricycles may still be approved as motor vehicles and used on public roads (if they comply with the relevant motor vehicle safety requirements).

Yes
No

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

Tricycles can be used to carry loads and passengers, and so we agree that there is a safety justification to limiting their size to ensure that heavier tricycles that should be approved and regulated as motor vehicles are not able to circumvent those requirements.

We are not able to comment on whether 60 kg is the most appropriate weight.

Q4. If you consider that the unladen weight limit for electrically assisted tricycles should be increased, what limit, if any, should be applied? Please provide information to support your answer in the space below.

- 80 kg
100 kg
150 kg
No limit

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

See our response to question 3 above.

Q5. Do you consider that electrically assisted tricycles should be defined by another criterion other than by a prescribed weight limit? Some suggestions are included below or alternatively please add ideas of your own.

- Axle width
Maximum overall width
Maximum payload
Maximum gross vehicle mass
Commercial activity (e.g. hire and reward)

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

If defining EAPCs by some of the other criterion suggested below would prevent harmonisation with European regulations, it would defeat the purpose of these proposals. Therefore, unless there is a significant safety benefit to using another criterion, RoSPA considers that the current system is the most suitable.

However, there are clearly safety issues in relation to using EAPCs to carry passengers, especially for Hire or Reward. The Government should consider whether these, or other, regulations are sufficient to ensure that unsuitable EAPCs are not used for this purpose, and/or whether they are managed and operated in a safe manner.

Q6. Is the most sensible way to provide effective enforcement and to differentiate between cycles manufactured before and after a change in the GB Regulations, to require the date of manufacture to be included on the identification plate for new products?

- Yes
No

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

Requiring the date of manufacture to be included on the identification plate for new EAPCs would make enforcement easier and more cost-effective. Given that manufacturers are already required to fix a plate on EAPCs, there would be little, if any, additional cost.

Q7. If you do not agree that adding the date of manufacture to the identification plate is the best way to ensure effective enforcement and to differentiate between cycles manufactured before and after a change in the GB regulations. Please suggest alternative options.

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

Q8. If the GB Regulations are amended so that new EAPCs must only provide power assistance when the rider is pedalling - how long would retailers and manufacturers need to sell or convert existing stocks of “twist-and-go” type EAPCs?

Under EU rules, “Twist-and-Go” cycles are required to be approved for use on the road in the same way as electric mopeds. We recognise that the current GB requirements are unclear and we are considering transitional provisions to reduce the impact on manufacturers, retailers and importers.

6 months	<input type="checkbox"/>
12 months	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
18 months	<input type="checkbox"/>
More than 18 months	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

To some extent picking any time period is arbitrary. However, presumably there would be a period in advance of the date of the new regulations coming into force, during which retailers would be aware of the need to sell or convert their existing stock of twist and go type EAPCs. Therefore, it seems reasonable not to permit a very long period after the date the new regulations come into force.

Q9. Can you give an indication of the current sales volumes of EAPCs in GB? An indication of the split between twist-and-go and pedal assist cycles would be useful.

RoSPA has no information about sales volumes of EAPCs.

Q10. Are manufacturers and retailers likely to suffer any additional costs as a result of these changes? If so can you quantify them?

Yes

No

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

We are not in a position to comment on this.

Q11. Do you see these proposals creating new opportunities for the use of EAPCs? If so what would they be?

Yes

No

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

Q12. Do you think these proposals will offer consumers a greater choice of product?

Yes

No

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

Harmonising GB requirements with European ones should enable a wider range of EAPCs to be made available in Great Britain.

Q13. What groups do you think will most benefit from these proposals? E.g. young, older people, commuters, etc.

Young (over 14)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adults (18 to 35)	<input type="checkbox"/>
(36 to 50)	<input type="checkbox"/>
(51 and over)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Less able	<input type="checkbox"/>
Commuters	<input type="checkbox"/>
Others	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

It is not clear what groups are currently more likely to use EAPCs and or whether any would be more likely to use them if these proposals were implemented.

Q14. Do you have any other comments on the issues raised in this consultation document?

Please return this form by 30 MARCH 2010 to:

EAPC Consultation
Department for Transport
2/04 Great Minster House
76 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DR

Tel: 020 7944 2086
Fax: 020 7944 2196
Email: eapcconsultation@dft.gsi.gov.uk