

## Report on the FBHVC MOT exemption survey

### LEGISLATION

David Hurley

### HISTORIC VEHICLES MoT EXEMPTION REVIEW

The Department for Transport issued a consultation paper in November 2011 proposing as its preferred option a complete exemption from testing requirements for all pre-1960 vehicles, a far wider proposal than had been considered within FBHVC. Other options being considered by DfT were complete exemptions for all pre-1945 vehicles and all pre-1920 vehicles, or do nothing. The background to the discussions on the MoT test consultations has been well reported in previous newsletters.

The three month consultation period was inadequate for FBHVC to employ its usual method to gain feedback on these wider proposals. Consequently, it was decided to gauge the views of enthusiasts by means of an on-line survey and full details were given in the last newsletter, on the website, and to the press.

Over 4000 responses were gathered on-line. The survey enabled comment on the choice of cut-off date and at the time of going to press these comments are still being analysed, although it has been possible to broadly categorise these opinions. Those taking part were asked to indicate the age of vehicle they owned, and this piece of information will also be taken into account when the final analysis of the results has been made.

#### Summary of Results

- 74% of respondents wish to see testing requirements for historic vehicles relaxed.
- 59% support the government's preferred option of exempting all pre-1960 vehicles.
- 71% believe historic vehicles in commercial use should be subject to testing even if other pre-1960 vehicles are exempted; 14% said commercial use should make no difference to testing requirements.
- 53% of respondents said they would take their vehicles for test if this could be done on a voluntary basis; 33% said they would not seek a voluntary test.

The opinions and reasons for them were qualified in many of the responses with conditional statements that the choice only applied if various conditions were met. Most common conditions were that there should be:

- no risk of restriction on use;
- no risk of increased insurance premiums for untested vehicles;
- no risk of insurers demanding (expensive) engineer's reports;
- some facility for a formal standardised test to demonstrate roadworthiness.

The report will be published in full on the FBHVC website, [www.fbhvc.co.uk](http://www.fbhvc.co.uk) when the analysis has been completed.

In the last issue we indicated that we are seeking clarification from the DfT on aspects of the consultation, in particular on the ability to submit vehicles that fall inside the scope of any exemption to a voluntary test. The necessity for an MoT test is enshrined in other regulations: first registration on import; as part of the V765 procedure; obtaining an age related mark; transfer of marks; re-licensing from unlicensed etc. In all these circumstances a test is necessary for safety reasons and the prevention of fraud, and in the case of the import of vehicles never registered in the UK, conformity with Construction and Use regulations where the current Individual Vehicle Approval test would not be appropriate. We will be asking the Department for Transport to seriously consider this.

We are very grateful to all those who took part in the survey and also to Jim Whyman who did the analysis and administration while working to a very tight deadline.

By the time this newsletter is published, the analysis will have been completed and the board will have considered all feedback received before finalising FBHVC's response to the consultation.

There is a similar consultation taking place in Northern Ireland called: Proposal on Possible Exemption of Certain Categories of Historic Vehicles from MoT Testing. We will be sending a response to the Department of the Environment Road Safety and Vehicle Regulation Division to this consultation as well.