

New vehicle tax rules moves DVLA in to the world of webinar

From 1 April 2017, the way vehicle tax is calculated is changing for new cars and some motorhomes. These changes will only apply to cars registered with DVLA on or after 1 April 2017. We've been working closely with stakeholders over the past 12 months to make sure that in the run up to this, they're aware of the changes and know what, if anything, they need to do to prepare.

Key stakeholders for the new vehicle tax rules are fleet companies. Traditionally, we tend to speak face to face with this customer base, but this can be time consuming and costly for either side when travelling to meetings. So, we asked our fleet customers what the preferred way of communicating with them would be – the consensus was that a 'webinar' would work. We'd trialled a new webinar kit recently, so we were looking for an opportunity to use it for the first time. With our fleet customers keen, this was an exciting opportunity to put our new kit into practice!

Two trials later and we were ready to go live. We sent a link to all who expressed an interest and at 10.30am on 10 January we were ready to broadcast.

In total, 195 participants joined the webinar to watch the presentation and listen to the commentary provided by Helen Jones and Rhian Townsend, two of our more experienced Service Designers.



Behind the scenes (in a room not far away!), colleagues were waiting to answer questions as they came through. We were poised with laptops at the ready to answer all that we could. An hour later, presentation over and all questions answered, the webinar was done.

Feedback we've had since suggests that it went down really well. So it's an excellent example of how sharing ideas and working together with our

stakeholders helps us meet their needs. Well worth it.

It also shows that our investment in the webinar kit is well worth having and in future we'll be putting it to good use for other audiences too.

If you weren't able to make it on the day you can see the presentation and the questions that were asked during the webinar [here](#)

Follow DVLA on [Twitter](#), [Facebook](#) and [LinkedIn](#) and subscribe to our [Digital Services Blog](#).

[Let's block ads! \(Why?\)](#)

[Press release: Court gives waste offender time to clean up site](#)

Colin Barnes had previously failed to clear the site ahead of the court hearing on Wednesday 25 January after his environmental permit was revoked.

Barnes, who traded as CT Barnes Autos, was taken to court by the Environment Agency after failed attempts to get him to comply with the law.

King's Lynn magistrates deferred sentencing him and have given him six months to clear the site. He is due back in the court on 26 July.

The permit held by Barnes, aged 59, of Podmore Lane, Scarning was revoked by the Environment Agency after he continually failed to run the site in line with the conditions in his permit. Following the revocation Barnes was required to remove the large amounts of waste remaining on site.

Mrs Megan Selves, prosecuting, said the deadline for removing all the waste was extended three times to dates suggested by the defendant, as waste officers tried to support him to do the right thing. But despite removing some of the waste, most of it remained two years later.

She told the court that Barnes had an environment permit to store waste vehicles and parts but it was revoked on 15 September 2014. All the waste should have been removed by 3 November 2014.

Barnes failed to respond to advice given by Environment Agency officers and despite agreeing to deadlines for when he could remove the waste, he has failed to comply and the waste remains on site,

He has repeatedly flouted the law and undermined the legitimate waste management industry.

Magistrates heard that Barnes had operated the site since 1977 as a vehicle repair and service business until 2006 when he obtained a permit and began depolluting and dismantling vehicles which had come to the end of their lives.

Since the issuing of the permit there has been a history of non-compliance so the permit was revoked.

Barnes told investigating officers that since the revocation he had been removing some of the waste but had to rely on others as he did not have a waste carriers licence at the time and they sometimes took a long time to collect it as the value of the waste had decreased.

After the hearing Environment Agency officer Rob Brodie said:

Unregulated waste activities can impact both visual and amenity and can cause harm to the environment and human health.

These offences were committed over 21 months and despite advice and guidance from us and agreements to extend deadlines for the removal of waste, very little of it was removed.

Mrs Selves said Barnes had a history of non-compliance with warnings from the Environment Agency and has previous convictions for similar environmental offences.

Barnes pleaded guilty to:

Between 4 November 2014 and 2 August 2016 on land at Willow Lodge, Podmore Lane, Scarning, Dereham, Norfolk NR19 2NS you did operate a regulated facility, namely a waste operation for the storage of waste motor vehicles and vehicle parts, without being authorised by an environmental permit granted under Regulation 13 of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010.

Contrary to Regulation 12(1)(a) and 38(1)(a) Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010

[Press release: MJ Curle Ltd ordered to pay £32,920 for environmental waste offences](#)

On Thursday 26 January 2017, Stuart Curle, director of MJ Curle Ltd,

Sunnymead Farm, Shifnal, Telford, pleaded guilty at Telford Magistrates' Court to operating a regulated facility that was not authorised by an environmental permit, both on behalf of the company, MJ Curle Ltd and separately in his capacity as the director of the company.

The 45-year-old was fined £1,200 and ordered to pay in excess of £25,000 in compensation and costs to the Environment Agency, along with a £120 victim surcharge. Additionally, the company was fined £6,600. The court also ordered that the 1,700 tonnes of waste that remains on-site is to be removed within the next 6 months, by 25 July 2017.

Environment Agency officers visited the site on 13 January 2015 to carry out an inspection. They found a large number of skips containing a variety of waste, including cardboard and green waste. Other parts of the site were used for storing and sorting a variety of waste, some of which originated from demolished conservatories. There was also evidence of waste being burned on the site.

The activities undertaken on the site require an environmental permit. However, the defendant never applied for one. As a result the defendant avoided application and subsistence fees in excess of £14,000. Around 1,700 tonnes of waste were found on the land. To dispose of this legally it will cost MJ Curle Ltd approximately £130,000.

Under caution, Stuart Curle admitted to a range of waste being brought to the site as a result of a business relationship with a local company. He also accepted that MJ Curle Ltd had been collecting skips full of waste and once they were transported back to the site, the waste was sorted and stored. He accepted that the activity required an environmental permit, something which the Environment Agency had warned him about in 2008.

During the hearing at Telford Magistrates Court, the Bench found that the previous warnings given by the Environment Agency to the defendant regarding the illegal activities on the site, in 2008, were a seriously aggravating feature of the current offending. However in mitigation the defence raised the defendant's serious ill health and the financial difficulties that have blighted the family as a result. The defendant also asked the court to take into account the defendant's co-operation with the Environment Agency and his admissions in interview.

Speaking after the case, an Environment Agency officer in charge of the investigation said:

When we entered the site in 2015, there was clear evidence of a deliberate and unlawful waste processing and storage operation. Stuart Curle was previously spoken to by Environment Agency officers about the need to obtain an environmental permit to undertake this activity. Unfortunately he failed to heed that guidance. We are pleased with the outcome of this case and we will actively bring prosecutions where deliberate unlawful processing and storage is identified.

RR1085 – Exploring the human and physical factors associated with telescopic handler overturning risks

A combination of machine instability and various human factors elements are important precipitating factors in telescopic handler overturn incidents. Industry guidance makes a number of assumptions about the impact of operator “knowledge gaps”, however the link between operator knowledge gaps and overturn risk is, at present, hypothetical and remains empirically untested.

This study was done to identify:

- the full range of human factors issues that might potentially contribute to telescopic handler overturn incidents;
- the human factors issues that appear to be most important in terms of overturn risk and
- key operator knowledge gaps that could increase the probability of an operator overturning a machine.

The research indicates that a machine is more likely to overturn when its boom is raised and /or extended. Overturn incidents are also strongly related to lateral (in contrast to longitudinal) instability. As some operators were not aware of the overturn risk related to lateral instability, this implies the possibility of a knowledge gap among operators. Weaknesses in training and site management/supervision are also likely to increase overturn risk. The installation of lateral instability warning technology could reduce overturn risks by warning operators of dangerous situations before a critical threshold is reached.

Assistance in the use of Adobe Acrobat PDF files is available on our [FAQs](#) page.

RR1084 – Forklift truck reverse sensor systems assessment

Counterbalance forklift trucks (FLT) are widely used in a variety of industry sectors for material handling. Incidents involving FLT are typically vehicle/pedestrian, vehicle/vehicle, or vehicle/structure collisions. Of these, vehicle/pedestrian incidents have the most potential

for reportable injury and around 500 incidents a year involving moving FLT's are reported to HSE.

Measures to improve or augment the operator's field of vision can include: mirrors and CCTV systems (which rely on the operator's observations) and sensor systems (including ultrasonic, radar, and Radio Frequency Identification (RFID)), similar to those commonly fitted to passenger vehicles; or simply improving the driver's operating position.

This report describes work undertaken to assess the active sensor systems (ultrasonic and radar) commonly used to reduce the risk of collisions. The systems tested appeared to provide a useful function in mitigating the risk of collision by stopping the truck when an obstruction was detected. However, certain configurations produced blind spots in the detection zones that could allow a pedestrian to approach the truck without being detected. The sensors also needed to be mounted to give an appropriate detection zone without producing a large number of false detections.

Companies should establish the conditions under which they will be operating an FLT and select a system that best fits their particular operating environment. Consideration should be given in the first instance to the practicability of removing pedestrians from the working area, although it is acknowledged that this is not always possible.

Assistance in the use of Adobe Acrobat PDF files is available on our [FAQs](#) page.