VINTAGE VEHICLES Consultation Response Form

Annex A

Part 1 – Information About You

Part 2 – Response Form

Q1.

Do you agree that changes should be implemented to the roadworthiness testing requirements for vintage vehicles? If yes, please provide details; if not, please state why?

One can only change something which is already in place because “change” differs fundamentally from the “introduction” of something which was not there before! Q1 therefore asks if the EXISTING roadworthiness testing requirements for vintage vehicles should be changed, and if yes, in what way. The information given in the consultation document clearly demonstrates that the only vintage vehicles which are tested at the moment are all vehicles built 1980 – 1983 and all pre 1980 vehicles used for commercial purposes, ambulances, buses, goods vehicles and their trailers. Therefore existing roadworthiness testing requirements are confined to these groups of vehicles because all other pre 1980 vehicles are test exempt. Changes to the roadworthiness testing requirements can therefore only refer to and concern and affect the testing requirements in regard to these aforementioned groups of vehicles.

Because vehicles used for commercial purposes are especially dealt with in Q2 (and again in Q8) I can restrict my answer to vintage vehicles built 1980 – 1983. At the moment there is a manifest distinction in place of two classes of vintage vehicles, but this distinction was never officially introduced but is merely the result of present conflicting regulations:

- vintage first class / order (all pre 1980 vehicles)

- vintage second class / order (all vehicles built 1980 – 1983)

Principles of equality, fairness and coherence have to be considered and applied, and this leads necessarily to a need for change. And in consequence the only logical and reasonable conclusion is that vehicles built 1980 – 1983 used for social and domestic purposes have to be treated in the same way as pre 1980 vehicles used for social and domestic purposes and become test exempt. And in consequence again this means that the change has to be that all vehicles older than 30 years have to be test exempt! (this is Option 4 in Q5 – option 2 in Q5 has therefore become part of option 4 and can from now on be neglected in its restricted sense, is no longer feasible!)

The theoretically possible conclusion that all vehicles used on the roads irrespective of age should be compulsory tested is outside of the confines / scope of this consultation, would not confirm with EU directives, would make this consultation process pointless and superfluous. This kind of change can at once be dismissed and discarded which is made clear by its absence in the consultation document, and it is therefore not considered as a candidate for proposals in Q5.

Q2.

Do you agree that all vehicles used for commercial purposes (irrespective of age) should continue to be subjected to compulsory roadworthiness testing? If yes, please provide details; if not, please state why?

All vehicles used for commercial purposes (irrespective of age) should continue to be subjected to compulsory roadworthiness testing (in regard to “details” please see comment in second paragraph to Q4).

But all “commercial vehicles” older than 30 years used solely for social and domestic purposes have to be considered as vintage vehicles and according to principles of equality, fairness and coherence have to become test exempt!

(see Q8 in regard to issues of compliance and enforcement)

Q3.

Do you believe that a voluntary testing arrangement tailored for vintage vehicles not subject to compulsory testing would be of benefit, and, if so, up to what age vehicles should be accommodated by such an arrangement?

Maybe a voluntary system could be beneficial in some, albeit very rare and exceptional circumstances. However how it could be tailored especially for vintage vehicles is an essential problem - historic vehicle experts would be required to develop tailor made tests for an array of very different types and makes of vehicles from a wide range of different periods because to tailor made a test of a specific vehicle of the 30s would need to be rather different e.g. to a tailor made test of a specific vehicle of the 60s or 70s. And because it would be roadworthiness which

would be needed to be tested it would be not worth the effort – only a very basic roadworthiness test would be necessary in these rare and exceptional circumstances and this would not differ from general basic inspections carried out by classic car enthusiasts or competent mechanics, workshops or garages.

So, to summarize it: no voluntary testing arrangement tailored for vintage vehicles is necessary! NCT Test Centers should, if somebody so wishes (because e.g. for lack of other possibilities), accept a vintage vehicle for a basic roadworthiness inspection with the aim to assist an owner of a vintage vehicle to assess the necessary work to be carried out to make the vehicle safe for use on the road.

Q4.

Do you believe that the standards to which pre 1980 vehicles are inspected should be revised? If yes, please provide details of any changes you think need to be made to the methods of inspection/reasons for failure (as appropriate) currently applied at both NCT/CVRT Test Centres?

In answering this question it may be useful to consult the NCT, LCV and HCV Tester's Manuals. (Click on links highlighted in blue above to access these documents.)

Pre 1980 vehicles with the exception of pre 1980 vehicles used for commercial purposes, ambulances, buses, goods vehicles and their trailers are not subject to any kind of inspection at a NCT Test Center unless they are imported newly into the country and need to be registered here. I am satisfied that the standards to which these imported pre 1980 vehicles are inspected are sufficient (all necessary data for the registration process e.g. VIN/chassis no., number of windows, doors, seats, etc are inspected and recorded) therefore no changes for this are needed!

In regard to pre 1980 vehicles used for commercial purposes and ambulances, buses, goods vehicles and their trailers (used as such, commercially) I am not competent enough and therefore can not give a reasonable judgment in regard to the question if the standards of inspection of such vehicles should be revised. However, as already pointed out in Q2, all "commercial vehicles" older than 30 years including ambulances, buses, goods vehicles and

their trailers which are not used commercially but solely for social and domestic purposes have to be considered vintage vehicles and are therefore no longer subject to any compulsory inspection, as vintage vehicles they have to be test exempt!

Q5.

If you agree that roadworthiness testing arrangements should be changed per Q1 above, which of the four options for exempting vehicles used for social and domestic purposes do you prefer – Option 1 (exempt pre-1960 vehicles), Option 2 (exempt pre-1980 vehicles), Option 3 (exempt vehicles over 40 years old) or Option 4 (exempt vehicles over 30 years old)? Please state why?

Not worked at this [[Recommend choosing Option 4. A rolling period is consistent with current tax legislation. Provides consistent set regulations for all vehicles. Preserves classics for future generations. Encourages job creation as more restored cars are on the road. Increased support for charities and community organisations. They understand there may be a need to limit usage of classic cars under this scheme]]

Q6.

If additional exemptions are introduced for vehicles used for social and domestic purposes based on age, do you think that vehicles which are not roadworthy might be used on public roads leading to increased incidences of road traffic accidents? If yes, please explain why?

Not worked at this [[Insurance companies state that there is a lower risk of accident with vintage vehicles. Vintage cars are not as fuel efficient or as comfortable as modern cars. Repairs are often costly which means only car enthusiasts are willing to shoulder these costs. Vintage Clubs do not support daily driving. Vintage cars are often maintained to a higher standard than modern cars.]]

Q7.

If the review concludes that 1960 to 1980 vintage vehicles used for social and domestic purposes should be subjected to compulsory roadworthiness testing, do you think that

vehicles which have been modified since first registration would have difficulty in passing a test? If yes, please provide details?

Not worked at this [[Modified cars would find it difficult to pass the test as they don't conform to test standards. However these modifications may have increased the car safety, i.e., better brakes. Experts will be happy to assist in explaining any modifications and the reasons for them.]]

Q8.

Do you agree with the proposals put forward in Section 9 regarding effective enforcement to ensure that vehicles used for commercial purposes comply with the obligation to be tested? If yes, please indicate your preferred option; if not, please state why including details of any alternative measures that you think might be more appropriate?

Issue of Section 9 of the consultation document is with vehicles (irrespective of age) used for commercial purposes. All such vehicles are subject to statuary roadworthiness inspections which have to be demonstrable when such a vehicle is due for taxation:

Public Service Vehicles (PSV) need proof of inspection, for vehicles subject to a Road Passenger Transport Operators License (RPTOL) and for vehicles subject to a Road Transport Operators License (RTOL) one has to provide Certificates of Roadworthiness (CRW) when they are due for taxation.

So far the current situation is unambiguous: all vehicles used for commercial purposes irrespective of age (and therefore including all such used vehicles older than 30 years) are subject to statuary roadworthiness inspections and need proof of this done when taxation is due. But now Section 9 states a problematic passage the meaning of which is rather obscure:

"However, the obligation to hold either a RPTOL or a RTOL does not apply to the owners / operators of vehicles used for the transport of their own passengers / goods."

Until recently I owned e.g. a 1993 registered VW van with seats for 7 persons (insurance cover for social and domestic use), the 5 seats in the middle and rear of the vehicle were movable and removable according to factory specification. I certainly used this vehicle on many occasions to "transport" more than only myself as driver (family members, relatives, friends, neighbors etc)

and at times all seats were occupied. But surely this was not in breach of any regulation, and a RPTOL was in no way necessary. I had seats removed on many occasions to transport larger items when shopping or to transport e.g. my large lawnmower or my motorbike, and this was no breach of regulations either and therefore I did not need some RTOL. The same applies to one of my other vehicles I own, a pre 1980 Series Land Rover taxed as vintage vehicle, used for social and domestic purposes and insured accordingly, with which I can transport passengers or goods as well when necessary. No RPTOL or RTOL is needed because it definitely is not used for commercial purposes (if I would use it commercially with my current insurance cover I would be not covered by insurance any longer; but this would be illegal and a criminal offense and I would be liable to prosecution, and rightly so!).

So the above cited passage in Section 9 states the obvious and a normal, wholly legal practice, even if one specifies the used “vehicles” with “vintage/veteran vehicles”, or “vehicles older than 30 years”. The use and meaning of “however” at the beginning of this passage is the problematic thing because it indicates that there is a problem when in reality there is none!

[Not finished yet – a bit more to come!]

Q9.

Would the insurance premiums for vintage vehicles used for social and domestic purposes be likely to rise if they were exempt from compulsory roadworthiness testing? If yes, please explain why and provide relevant supporting info?

Not worked at [[Insurance companies see vintage policies as low risk. Some companies won’t provide insurance to a driver who does not have a policy for a daily driver. Some companies require club membership – should this be made compulsory?]]

Q10.

Do you have any comments, data, or analysis that would be beneficial to the RSA in evaluating the costs, benefits and other impacts likely to arise from the proposed Options? If yes, please provide details?

Not worked at [[Could lead to a 75 – 80% decrease in amount of vintage cars registered. This will have a knock on effect:

o Less tax collected.

o Less vintage insurance policies sold.

o Less spend on fuel.

o Less vintage services completed which leads to less jobs.

§ Estimated 35 – 40 jobs relating to vintage cars in Limerick.

o Less club memberships = less merchandise made = less jobs.

Hotels/restaurants are also affected as less people attend vintage car events. Implementation will cost more than potential revenue gains. Impact on money raised for local charities, clubs and organisations. Vintage events are the only social outlet for some – more isolation can lead to increase in severe depression.

30 year rolling exemption will lead to more vintage cars on the road which has the opposite effect to the above.]]

Summary