

## In This Issue

- **Local Authority Parking Consultation**
- **Changing a Borough's Parking Policies**
- **Cycling in London**
- **Flashing Cycle Lights**
- **Aldgate Gyratory Redesign**
- **Deaths on the Roads**
- **Thames River Crossings**
- **More Average Speed Cameras**
- **Wide Area 20 Mph Speed Limits**
- **News Snapshots**
- **A.B.D. Information and Contacts**

## Editorial

One of the recent good news items was that the Government have abandoned plans to toll the improved A14. The proposals were covered in our last edition with some suggestions on how you should object. Indeed there was very widespread opposition to tolling the new road and it is clear that was the reason the idea was dropped. It definitely pays to object to proposals that do not make sense and the £1.5bn cost will now be funded by central Government (no doubt out of the many taxes that road users already pay).

The more disappointing news is that 20-mph speed limit proposals have been adopted in Camden and the City of London. These proposals are fundamentally misconceived as money is being spent on measures that will have negligible impact on accident figures. Indeed they might actually increase as has happened in some areas where 20 mph limits have been imposed. Why that is so is not clear, but it is very obvious that the advocates of 20 mph speed limits push their agenda without studying the evidence. It's more an irrational commitment to a concept than evidence based science.

Continued...

*Rather like religious zealots, the advocates of wide area 20 mph speed limits ignore the evidence in favour of emotional commitment, misrepresent the facts in their promotional material, and generally have little knowledge about road safety. They, and readers of this newsletter, should remember that if money is spent on putting up signs that have no benefit, then that is money not spent on real road safety benefits - such as road engineering measures.*

*Another area where irrationality has crept in is the advocacy of speed cameras where the evidence is again very open to dispute. But it has not stopped TfL planning the implementation of new average speed cameras on main arterial roads in London - see article on page 6. As is common when people wish to ignore the evidence, there has been no public consultation on this matter to enable the evidence to be properly examined.*

*I hope you find this Newsletter interesting and wish you all the best for the New Year. The Alliance of British Drivers (ABD) tries to bring some sense into the transport policies followed in London, but we do need your support to do that. If you are not already a member of the ABD you may care to join - see <http://www.freedomfordrivers.org/Membership.htm> for more information.*

Roger Lawson, Editor

## Local Authority Parking Consultation



We covered the issue of the use of cameras to enforce parking restrictions in our last edition when a new "Surveillance Camera Code of Practice" was published by the Home Office. This reinforced

the previous guidance issued by the DfT but it seems that Parking Appeals Adjudicators (PATAS in London) have been ignoring this guidance. As to why is not exactly clear as they do actually have wide discretion.

London is of course the area of the country where cameras are used extensively with many London boroughs using fixed cameras and also mobile cameras to enforce parking. Usually the roads covered could just have easily been covered by manned patrols so councils have simply been ignoring Government guidelines - no doubt in the interests of making money - or as they might put in "in the interests of cost-effective parking enforcement".

### **New Public Consultation on Parking**

The Government is now planning to put a stop to these abuses by simply stopping the use of CCTV for on-street parking enforcement. They have issued a public consultation on the general area of parking. Other proposals they are consulting on are:

- Allowing discounts from parking fines to be obtained even if an appeal is made. The lack of a discount is of course designed to discourage appeals. They suggest 25%, but shouldn't it be the same as normal for prompt payment, i.e. 50%?
- A way for residents and businesses to force councils to review their parking policies.
- Grace periods for parking contraventions. For example a few minutes allowance if you overstay your allotted time in a parking bay.

These proposals all seem eminently sensible and readers are encouraged to respond to the consultation which is present here:

[www.gov.uk/government/consultations/local-authority-parking](http://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/local-authority-parking)

*(Editor: do respond promptly and give them your views. You could also ask for cameras to be banned for moving traffic offences such as box junction infringements and speeding offences. They are an infringement of liberty to have the population monitored by cameras all the time, and undermines justice when the first thing you know about an alleged offence is a penalty notice in the post some time later.*

*In addition you could ask for PATAS to be funded by central Government as is the rest of the judiciary rather than out of the funds obtained from fines issued by Local Authorities which is likely to be prejudicing their decisions).*

Incidentally almost 5 million Penalty Charge Notices were given to motorists in London in the financial year 2012-2013. This is only very slightly down on the previous year.

---

## **Changing a Borough's Parking Policies**



There was a minor revolution in the London Borough of Bromley recently when the council were persuaded to substantially reduce their parking charges in Chislehurst.

Above is a photograph of one of the car parks affected. Yes it's not very beautiful but that's the subject of other ideas for "landscaping". Usage of this car park has been falling of late which has resulted in lots of empty spaces even though this is very near Chislehurst High Street and a large Sainsbury's store. What has been happening is that as charges have gone up over the years, and the recession has bitten recently, people just moved to parking in nearby side roads where there are no parking restrictions. Or they have stopped visiting the "village" and its shops altogether - the major shopping centre of Bluewater is only a few minutes away with acres of free car parking. With charges of 30p per hour in the above car park, or £3.50 (a recent increase) for the whole day it was not surprising that people "voted with their feet", particularly those who needed to stay longer.

Local traders were not happy and both the Chislehurst Town Team (see their web site at <http://www.visitchislehurst.org.uk>) and the local amenity group called the Chislehurst Society (see <http://www.chislehurst-society.org.uk/>) combined to make representations on this issue.

It seemed nonsensical that charges had been increased to a level that deterred usage and hence possibly reduced income to the council from these car parks while inconveniencing local residents and deterring high street trade.

The required evidence was collected to make the case for change and after consideration councillors (led by Environment Portfolio Holder Colin Smith) agreed it should take place. All day parking (or anything over 4 hours) is now £2.00 instead of £3.50 although there has been a small increase in the charge for on-street parking in the High Street to encourage turnover and parking in the off-street car parks. In addition the availability of discounted "season tickets" is now being promoted which will assist shop staff and other local workers whereas previously few people even knew they were available.

This is a very satisfactory outcome and shows that it is possible to influence local councils if one is organised and persuasive. It helped in this case that a forceful and active character, Alison Stammers, sits on the Committees of both the above mentioned organisations, although your editor and others also had a hand in the matter. It always pays to engage with local councillors and council staff on such issues, but patience is also required as it takes some time to get anything through council bureaucracy.

---

## Cycling in London



The deaths on London roads of cyclists continue to get lots of media coverage. For example, the death of a single cyclist now generates an item on the London BBC and ITV news programmes whereas the multiple deaths of pedestrians, car drivers or other road users on the same day does not rate a mention.

Even the Executive Director of PACTS, David Davies, said to a Commons Transport Committee that *"In London and across the UK as a whole there are considerably more pedestrians, considerably more motorcyclists and vehicle occupants as well who die, so the number of cyclists deaths, although it has huge attention, is quite a small minority"*.

A particular focus has been on the design of the "Cycle Superhighways" where some run on the main arterial routes so cycles get mixed up with buses, HGVs, and other fast moving traffic. Poor junction design has been a particular problem with such locations as the Bow roundabout and Aldgate being the scene of fatalities.

Cyclists have been raising a lot of awareness of the dangers, but have not helped their cause by frequently acting rashly or ignoring traffic signals. For example it is known that one of the recent fatalities at the Bow Roundabout might have been prompted by the fact that the cyclist rode through a red light into the path of an HGV.



As anyone knows who walks or drives in London, cyclists flout the law and it's easy to take photos of them doing so (as in the photographs in this article taken near Tower Bridge).

Major Boris Johnson spelled it out by saying *"There's no question of blame or finger-pointing. That doesn't work in these circumstances. But unless people obey the laws of the road and people actively take account of the signals that we put in, there's no amount of traffic engineering that we invest in that is going to save people's lives."*



Speaking on LBC 97.3 on November 15th the Mayor also said: "Some of the cases that we've seen in the last few days really make your heart bleed because you can see that people have taken decisions that really did put their lives in danger. You cannot blame the victim in these circumstances. But what you can say is that when people make decisions on the road that are very risky - jumping red lights, moving across fast-moving traffic in a way that is completely unexpected and without looking to see what traffic is doing - it's very difficult for the traffic engineers to second-guess that. I'm appealing to all cyclists, as well as all motorists, do think of the laws of the road, because if you take these hasty, rash decisions that we're seeing sometimes, then you will be endangering your life."

But unfortunately the Mayor's comments were seen as blaming the wrong people by cycling fanatics and Green Party member Jenny Jones.

*(Editor's Comments: it is undoubtedly the case that the behaviour of cyclists in London has deteriorated in the last few years. However, the accident figures for cyclists have risen simply because the numbers of people cycling has grown enormously. The numbers of accidents per cycled mile has probably fallen but there are undoubtedly a lot of young and inexperienced cyclists who have got onto the roads of late. Some remedial work to existing Cycle Superhighways is probably justified, but in general the Mayor continues to spend more on cycling than is sensible, and promoting cycling does unfortunately encourage the use of a transport mode that is intrinsically relatively dangerous).*

### **London Cycle Grid**

On the latter point, the Mayor has announced £35m of funding to improve CS2 and a new network of "quietways" in London so as to form a new "Grid" linking the Cycle Superhighways and other cycle lanes, i.e. a network of backstreets so as to "de-Lycrafy" cycling in the capital in Boris's words.

See the diagram below and go here for more details (you can send in your own comments as has the ABD):

<http://www.tfl.gov.uk/roadusers/cycling/29172.aspx>



Note that the ABD generally supports the concept of off-street cycle routes but we are opposed to road closures or road space reduction which some of the above proposals involve. Encouraging the use of quieter roads by cyclists probably does make sense though.

### **Cycle Hire Scheme**

Meanwhile the Mayor continues to expand the cycle hire scheme sponsored by Barclays despite a fall in usage of 14% (year to end September 2013 compared with 2012) and continuing financial losses (the subsidy last year was over £11m even after a contribution of £5m from Barclays). Charges were doubled in January but the Mayor blames the fall on the "post Olympics" effect. He is pushing ahead with an "electric bike" hire scheme in the Muswell Hill area of North London, which is somewhat hilly. But Barclays have announced they are not renewing their sponsorship of the cycle hire scheme when the existing deal expires in 2015. *(Editor: I wonder if that is why the most recently announced Cycle Superhighway in South London won't have a Barclays "blue" surface treatment? Will all the other ones have to be repainted in 2015?).*

---

### **Flashing Cycle Lights**

It was brought to your Editor's attention recently that cyclists in London seem to be escalating their use of lamps to warn other road users of their presence. Flashing forward (white) and rear (red) lights are common and are apparently legal but their brightness seems to be growing with cyclists not seeming to care how distracting they become. Although the Highway Code specifically recommends that flashing lights not be used on unlit streets, nobody seems to pay any attention to that rule.

Even in the dimly lit suburbs of London, it can be disconcerting to meet one of these new breed of mobile lighthouses head on. The brightness is so great that anything behind the cyclist is hidden from view - and it's not even obvious that it is a cyclist at all because all one sees is a blinding and distracting light. Surely these lights should be discouraged or regulations brought in to curtail this race by cyclists to have the brightest lamps?

---

### Aldgate Gyratory Redesign



One element of the proposed "Cycle Grid" mentioned about is a redesign of the Aldgate gyratory system (the large "roundabout" that encircles Aldgate tube station in the City of London) - see diagram above.

This is likely to be of major concern to road users as the previous removal of a similar gyratory to the East of Aldgate has worsened traffic congestion substantially in the area - for example on the Inner Ring Road where traffic now often queues back to Tower Bridge.

Search the web using "Aldgate gyratory consultation" for more details - there was a past consultation on this area but a new one based on the latest proposals has yet to commence. The ABD will be submitting some comments.

---

### Deaths on the Roads

When discussing the dangers of cycling, or using the roads in general, it is worth remembering that the home is a lot more dangerous but nobody seems to worry about it. The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents has reported that back in 1990 more people died on the roads than in their homes from accidents. Since then home accident fatalities have risen by 50% to about 5,000 per year while road accidents have fallen substantially, so the situation has been reversed.

You might think that a lot of home deaths might be of the elderly (for example from falls), but in fact a high proportion are of young people. Over half of those who die are under 65 and 30% are under 45.

*Editor: meanwhile we get endless debate and enormous amounts of expenditure on schemes with little proven benefit such as wide-area 20-mph zones. London alone spends many millions of pounds via TfL on road safety schemes, with no measurement on how effective they are.*

---

### Thames River Crossings

Transport for London (TfL) have published a further document on the subject of the River Crossings Consultation - in "Responses to issues raised" (available on the internet). It notes about 76% of respondents supported or strongly supported the proposal for a new road tunnel at Silvertown. The cost will be about £700m and work is now being progressed on plans for the tunnel. There were slightly more mixed views on replacing the Woolwich Ferry, but still general support for that proposal. There was also strong support for a ferry or bridge at Gallions Reach. There was strong opposition (55% opposed) to charging for the new river crossings. More consultations on all the above options are planned.

*(Editor: as is pointed out in the report, why should Thames river crossings in East London be charged when those in West London are not? Also as I pointed out to Isabel Dedring, Deputy Mayor for Transport, in a recent meeting although the Mayor might claim there is no way of funding these crossings without user charges, in reality that capital cost is similar to the annual subsidies to London buses alone in the last few years. The amortised annual cost of these new crossings would not actually be particularly significant in terms of the overall budgets of TfL).*

### Dartford Crossings

The Government has also announced some results from the public consultation on additional crossings at or near the existing Dartford tunnel/bridge. It has ruled out Option B - a crossing connecting the A2/A1089 and is focussing on a crossing near the existing one, or one much further down river.



One new bridge over the Thames is likely to go ahead though soon - a "Garden Bridge" for pedestrians and cyclists only from Temple to the South Bank. The Government has already committed £30m and TfL have promised £4m to this although it is being mainly funded by commercial organisations via a Trust promoted by Joanna Lumley. Total cost will be £150m with completion possible by 2017. An artists impression is above.

---

### More Average Speed Cameras



Transport for London (TfL) are pushing ahead with more average speed cameras in London.

They will be imposed on the A406

(North Circular), A40, A316 and the A2 (from Black Prince to the Blackwall Tunnel).

The cameras will enforce the speed limits on these roads (typically 50 mph) although many people think that is too low for some parts of these roads which are almost motorway standard. They will replace a number of fixed position speed cameras.

TfL claims there will be road safety benefits but the evidence from existing average speed camera sites is very inconclusive (for example on Lower/Upper Thames Street), and they also cost an enormous amount of money - capital cost of up to £15m plus high operating cost.

If you oppose the constant monitoring of your every movement via cameras in London, you may like to go to this Facebook page set up by an ABD member and "Like" it:

<https://www.facebook.com/pages/No-to-The-London-Average-Speed-Cameras/1389272434652732>

The ABD believes that drivers are the best people to judge the most appropriate speed for the road conditions and that taking responsibility away from drivers just makes matters worse in the long term.

Post your own comments on the Facebook page and invite your friends to support it also, plus of course make representations to the Mayor of London and your GLA representatives.

---

### Wide Area 20 Mph Speed Limits



The promoters of 20-mph speed limits in urban areas continue to promote their case in London boroughs, despite there being little evidence that simply putting up signs has any impact on accidents figures. Malcolm Heymer of the ABD has recently produced a paper entitled "ABD Position on 20 mph Speed Limits" which explains the issues very clearly. It's rather long for this newsletter but if anyone would like a copy please let the editor know.

The London Borough of Camden, who are notoriously anti-car, have already agreed a blanket speed limit of 20 mph in the borough. This is effective from Dec 13th 2013 although TfL controlled roads (arterial roads that are mainly "red routes") will not be included yet. Camden is still discussing those with TfL.



The City of London Corporation has also decided that the whole of the City should have a 20 mph speed limit.

City governing bodies did this based on a report from Corporation staff that contained numerous misleading statements and plain errors of fact. So your editor sent a letter to all the members of those governing bodies. Here is some of the content:

Dear Members,

I am aware that you recently discussed and approved a report on the Proposals for a wide-area 20 mph speed limit in the City of London (the report entitled "20 mph Speed Limit Benefits and Disbenefits Investigation"). Unfortunately the information contained in the report was misleading, and in some cases simply factually incorrect.

To cover the factual errors first:

1. It says in the report (Para.17) that "Speed is not recorded as a factor for most of the collisions within the City but then the Police do not record speed as a contributory factor if the vehicle was travelling at less than the prevailing speed limit (i.e. 30 mph". This is incorrect. The Police use the Stats19 form to record the Contributory Factors in personal injury accidents and there is Factor 307 which is described as "Travelling too fast for conditions". A description in the Notes for that form state this should be ticked where "Driver/rider was travelling within the speed limit, but their speed was not appropriate for the road conditions and/or vehicle type (including towing), and contributed to the accident.". Therefore the police could, for example, record incidents such as travelling at an excessive speed of over 20 mph in streets crowded with pedestrians. Other police forces certainly use that category and as there are national standards applied to completion of the Stats19 forms, I do not believe the City of London Police would vary from them. In other words, if there are no incidents recorded in that category or few in the category of exceeding the speed limit, then it probably means that excessive speed is not a significant cause of accidents in the City of London. So reducing the speed limit will have no effect.

2. It is stated in the report (Para.20) that "Several years ago, Transport for London introduced a 20mph limit on Upper Thames Street between Swan Lane and Queen Street to facilitate the refurbishment of Walbrook Wharf. There was a dramatic reduction in casualties. The three-year casualty total before the speed-limit reduction was

nine and the total for the three years of the 20mph limit was nil."

This does not accord with the information I obtained directly from TfL in relation to accidents on Lower/Upper Thames Street some time ago using a Freedom of Information Act request. I was interested in the impact of average speed cameras on accidents (they were set to 20-mph for a period and then increased to 30-mph).

The data I obtained showed there was some reduction in the period in the 2004-2007 period when I believe the 20-mph limit was in force, but there was still one serious accident and 9 slight accidents. The reduction might not be unexpected, irrespective of the speed limits and cameras, because the road was narrowed, congestion was increased due to that and the building and street works, pedestrian access was limited and the general visual appearance of the road was changed which is known to have a temporary impact on accidents.

I have raised these matters with Mr Everett but have not yet received a satisfactory explanation on the above issues.

3. I also wrote to Mr Everett on the subject of wide area 20-mph speed limits on the 6th July when this idea of imposing them in the City of London was first announced. I attach that letter in an Appendix and if you follow the link given in it you will find a lot of further evidence. Clearly my evidence was ignored in the aforementioned report.

4. The report states that the average mean speed throughout the City is already 22 mph which is quite low for an urban environment. The average reduction in the speed of traffic from imposing a 20 mph speed limit when it was previously 30 is about 1 mph – but it varies from scheme to scheme. On those where the traffic speed is already near 20, the reduction is likely to be much less than that. So in reality the City of London Corporation is proposing to spend a considerable sum of money on a measure that will have no impact on the number and severity of casualties!

5. I could go on at some length on the other deficiencies in the report, but I may bore you. But it does seem to me that it is a biased report that is prejudiced against vehicle drivers in the City, albeit that there are relatively few of them.



6. More evidence of such bias is the recent proposal to exclude traffic from streets around Bank which as a frequent pedestrian in the area I might welcome on some of the roads. But it is buses that cause a lot of the congestion and traffic fumes in that area (and use some of the roads being considered for closure), and it is obviously a very key "hub" for road transport in the City. Closing some of the roads to traffic would create exactly the same problems that occurred when Trafalgar Square was redesigned.

7. It also came to my attention recently that the City of London Corporation gave (via the City Bridge Trust) a considerable grant last year to the organisation named "Campaign for Better Transport", which is certainly misnamed.

That organisation promotes public transport (it is mainly funded by bus and train companies) and is virulently anti-car. For example it opposed removal of the Western extension of the congestion charge and the M4 bus lane, and has opposed many of Boris Johnson's transport policies.

In conclusion I would suggest that you should reconsider the merits of the proposed wide area 20-mph speed limit in the City of London. It is unlikely to be cost effective and if those who proposed it actually looked at the facts they would realise that the money wasted on it would be better spent on other road safety measures.

If you have any questions on this matter, please contact me.

<end>

Subsequent to that letter, it has been admitted that the claim of nil accidents when a 20-mph speed limit was imposed on Lower/Upper Thames Street was incorrect. What the exact figure was is still unclear because when I submitted FOI Act requests the City Corporation claimed they did not hold the relevant data (rather odd when they put claimed data in their report). Neither do the police apparently as it is more than 6 years ago and they do not retain STATS19 data for longer than that.

It is also unclear what TfLs policy is regarding main routes such as Lower/Upper Thames Street and whether they will allow the Corporation to impose a 20-mph speed limit.

But there will apparently be a public consultation before these plans are implemented. It's surely a pity that they did not consult more widely before deciding to push ahead with these proposals.

Incidentally a complaint has been made to the Information Commissioners Office about the handling of the FOI request on this matter. They are likely to get another one after a further request for information on the Aldgate scheme has not produced anything within the legal timeframe. It seems City Corporation staff are becoming obstructive.

---

## News Snapshots

Sundry news in the last few weeks that is worth a mention is as follows:

+ The Hammersmith Flyover in West London is a key arterial route but is also an ugly object that generates a lot of traffic noise. It is also now nearing the end of its useful life and needs repair.

There are plans afoot to replace it with a "flyunder" - basically a tunnel. Whether this is viable remains to be seen (the surface land made available as a result would be quite valuable of course), but the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham recently held a public meeting on the subject. See their web site for more information at <http://www.lbhf.gov.uk> (search for "flyunder" in the site search facility).

ABD Member Brian Mooney who lives in the borough is making representations on this topic.

+ Putney Bridge is likely to close altogether for six months for repair, much to the consternation of users. Some 41,000 vehicles per day use it including eleven bus routes.

+ UKIP has opposed HS2 (see our last edition for more explanation of this enormously expensive train project). For a good article on the subject under the title of "A Better Way to Spend £50 Billion" see: [www.ukipdaily.com/better-way-spend-50-billion](http://www.ukipdaily.com/better-way-spend-50-billion)

+ Stephen Glaister, Head of the RAC Foundation, has called for expansion of the London Congestion Charge into the suburbs.



In an interview given to Transport Network he suggested Boris Johnson needs to look at this and suggested the Government needs to examine wider road user charging. He suggested it "should be done now" in core cities across the UK.

*Editor's Comments: Prof. Glaister has long advocated this and other policies that are contrary to the interests of motorists (for example the support of speed cameras). How he ever became head of the RAC Foundation is unclear but clearly as an organisation it no longer represents road users and anyone who is interested in opposing this kind of nonsense should join the ABD.*

+ TfL is examining proposals to expand capacity on the A40 Western Avenue. This includes converting the hard shoulder under the Target roundabout to a new traffic lane and widening the section between the Greenford and Target roundabouts.

+ TfL are proposing "cashless" buses in London, plus the closure of tube ticket offices. Needless to say there have been many objections.

+ The Mayor is proposing to introduce a "safer lorry" charge in London to reduce the number of accidents involving cyclists and HGVs. Heavy Goods Vehicles would have to comply with specific safety standards in London or pay a special fee to discourage them. The Freight Transport Association immediately called it "unprecedented and authoritarian".

+ The Mayor has also sounded out the idea of banning cyclists from using headphones which is perceived as the cause of some accidents. Cyclists become oblivious to their surroundings and cannot hear vehicles nearby. *(Editor: I do recall speaking to one cyclist for riding on the pavement but she could not hear me. After removing her headphones when I repeated my complaint she explained that she had been knocked off her bike recently by a car so now rode on pavements. One can understand why and how that accident occurred).*

+ Liverpool City Council is to scrap all bus lanes for nine months in an experiment to reduce traffic congestion. Mayor Joe Anderson said they "simply don't work". *(Editor's comments: now would it not be a good idea if some London boroughs*

*did the same thing. I can never see any justification for prioritising buses over other road traffic - it's simply queue jumping by the social group who use buses in my opinion. In reality unless the volume of people carried by buses in bus lanes exceeds what would be carried by general traffic without any bus lane, then there is no justification for them - but only very rarely is that the case because most bus lanes are empty most of the time. Note: anyone who thinks this stance is rather peculiar is welcome to submit a rebuttal justifying why bus passengers should get priority and it will be published in the next edition - no more than 500 words please).*

+ The Government has approved the use of low level "repeater" traffic lights that are easier for cyclists to see and they are likely to be used in London rapidly. Bow roundabout is one of the likely sites.

### **About the Alliance of British Drivers (ABD)**

The Alliance of British Drivers was formed from a merger of the Association of British Drivers and the Drivers Alliance. The ABD is the leading independent organisation which represents the interests of private motorists in the United Kingdom. We campaign to protect the rights of individual road users and believe that road transport is a beneficial and essential element in the UK transport infrastructure. We oppose excessive taxation of motorists and are against tolls and road usage charging. We also campaign for more enlightened road safety policies. The Alliance is a "not for profit" voluntary organisation which is financially supported primarily by its individual members. More information on the ABD is available from our web site at [www.abd.org.uk](http://www.abd.org.uk)

### **Registering to Receive This Newsletter**

This newsletter is free of charge and is sent approximately bi-monthly to anyone who cares to request a copy. It is sent via email (as a link to a web page from which you can download it). To register for a free copy simply go to this web page: [www.freedomfordrivers.org/Newsletters.htm](http://www.freedomfordrivers.org/Newsletters.htm) and fill out the box to be added to our mailing list.

Note that the ABD maintains a list of members who are familiar with individual London boroughs and may be able to help with information on local issues in those boroughs. The current list is below. If any other members would like to keep an eye on local news and advise on local transport issues then please let me know. Roger Lawson

Contact person	Borough	Email
Les Alden	Southwark	<a href="mailto:LHA@looksouth.net">LHA@looksouth.net</a>
Paul Hemsley	Ealing	<a href="mailto:ph@hemsleyassociates.com">ph@hemsleyassociates.com</a>
Hillier Simmons	Hounslow	<a href="mailto:hilliersimmons@compuserve.com">hilliersimmons@compuserve.com</a>
Brian Mooney	Hammersmith & Fulham	<a href="mailto:fairdeal@abd.org.uk">fairdeal@abd.org.uk</a>
Roger Lawson	Bromley, Barking & Dagenham, Barnet, Bexley, Brent, Greenwich, Hackney, Haringey, Havering, Islington, Lewisham, City of London, Newham, Redbridge, Tower Hamlets, Waltham Forest	<a href="mailto:roger.lawson@abd.org.uk">roger.lawson@abd.org.uk</a>
Peter Morgan	Croydon, Camden, Enfield, Harrow, Hillingdon, Kensington & Chelsea, Kingston, Lambeth, Merton, Richmond, Sutton, Wandsworth, Westminster	<a href="mailto:southlondon@abd.org.uk">southlondon@abd.org.uk</a>

### Contact Information

This Newsletter is published by the London Region of the Alliance of British (A.B.D.), PO Box 62, Chislehurst, Kent, BR7 5YB and is distributed free of charge to ABD Members in the London area and to those Members of BBRAG who formerly received the Bromley Borough Roads Action Group newsletter. All material contained herein is Copyright of the A.B.D. or of the authors and may only be reproduced with permission. Any opinions expressed herein are solely those of the author of the article or that of the Editor which do not necessarily represent the official policies of the A.B.D.

A.B.D. London Region Co-ordinator and Editor: Roger Lawson (Tel: 020-8467-2686, Email: [roger.lawson@abd.org.uk](mailto:roger.lawson@abd.org.uk) ). Contact the above for information on the aims and objectives of the A.B.D. or for membership information (membership costs £25.00 per annum). The A.B.D. would be happy to advise or assist anyone who is concerned about any traffic, transport or road safety issues in London. Complimentary subscriptions to this newsletter are available on request to elected politicians or those with a professional interest in transport matters.

Our internet web address is: [www.freedomfordrivers.org](http://www.freedomfordrivers.org) (or [www.abd.org.uk](http://www.abd.org.uk) for the national ABD web site). This newsletter is supplied in electronic form which can be displayed and printed via the free Adobe Acrobat Reader. The Adobe Acrobat Reader can be downloaded from <http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat> . All past copies of our newsletters can be obtained from the [www.freedomfordrivers.org](http://www.freedomfordrivers.org) web site.