

ABD London News

Click on any index item below to go directly to the article in a digital edition.

In this Edition

- London and the Party Manifestos
- Air Pollution and the ULEZ
- UK Air Quality Plan
- Air Pollution, Oxford Street Buses and Nanoparticles
- Bank Junction Closed to Traffic
- The Rise of Non-Travel
- Reader's Letter
- Permit Parking Charges in Lambeth
- Survey Results
- Croydon 20—Pushing Ahead Regardless
- 20 MPH in Bath
- 20 MPH in the City

See the last page for publisher and contact information.

Editorial

One cannot get away from politics of late, and this newsletter is no exception. The first article focuses on the party manifestos and their likely impact on London travel. But the most serious issue is surely Sadiq Khan's plans for reducing air pollution in London via the ULEZ.

This is being consulted upon while the Mayor and Transport for London (TfL) refuse to disclose the costs of their proposals. So any cost/benefit analysis is impossible.

My conclusion is therefore that this may be just another way of raising money for the Mayor's transport budget which is known to be full of holes. And the spread of Clean Air Zones under the national plan could be simply a way to introduce more general road pricing.

Meanwhile all the main party candidates are supporting the move to zero emission vehicles (which probably means electric). It looks like they may be practical for a lot of journeys soon and the costs are coming down.

Electric cars only make sense to reduce air pollution if the power generation is clean. In other words is not created by burning coal, oil or natural gas. The latest announcement from National Grid said that because of the recent fine weather, on the 26th May, 24% of power generation at lunchtime was from solar with only 1% from coal. Some 23% was from nuclear with still 30% from natural gas and the rest from renewables. So we are getting there.

The cost of transitioning vehicles will be enormous though. In the meantime the debate on 20 mph speed limits continues. No benefits in the City of London, or Bath—see page 10, but the former have the solution it seems to their dismal results—more enforcement by the police is recommended. The City of London is driven by dogma, as is the borough of Croydon. They were both told it would have no benefit but did not listen. So an enormous amount of money has been wasted



Roger Lawson (Editor)
E-mail: roger.lawson@abd.org.uk

Quotes of the Month

"Promoting greater physical activity is a public health priority in London because it helps to prevent diseases such as type 2 diabetes, obesity, heart disease and some cancers." Sir Peter Hendy, London Transport Commissioner in a preface to his Transport Action Plan—see article on page 7.

"None of this [the poor air quality, particularly NOX emissions] is the fault of those who chose to buy diesel vehicles and as we tackle this problem, these same people should not be penalised for decisions they made in good faith".... Government publication on Revised Air Quality Plan—see page 5..





London and the Party Manifestos

On the 25th May UKIP published their General Election Manifesto. That completes the quartet of the main parties, so it seems an opportune time to analyse and comment on them so far as they affect transport in London.

In summary, UKIP's is very much a "pro-motorist" transport agenda.

Another aspect of their manifesto is the commitment to "balance migration", effectively reducing inward migration to zero over 5 years (and thereafter only a "one in, one out" policy as the media dubbed it). This would of course relieve the pressure in the longer term on the transport network (both road and rail), which suffers from major congestion in London mainly because of massive increases in passenger demand in recent years.

Conservative & Unionist ("Forward Together"). This party's manifesto is short on specifics, perhaps because their policies are very much a continuation of existing ones and because they seem to be relying

That is of course the sole concern of this newsletter so any diversion into wider political issues will be avoided so far as is practical.

UKIP. Let's start with UKIPs (subtitled "Britain Together") as that contains more specifics than the other parties and has a separate Chapter on Transport. It suggests they would:

- Scrap HS2 on the basis that it is unaffordable, will blight homes and will only save a few minutes on a London to Leeds trip.

- End all road tolls on the basis that they are an unfair burden on the already highly taxed road user. That would presumably include scrapping the London Congestion Charge, the ULEZ and proposed tolls on the Dartford and Blackwall Crossings.

more on the winning personality of Theresa May rather than specific vote winning policies. But there are a few comments on transport as follows:

- They will continue to invest £40 billion in transport projects, including: a) HS2, b) Northern Powerhouse Rail, c) Expansion of Heathrow Airport, and d) Development of the strategic road network including extra lanes on motorways. But there is no mention of Crossrail 2.

- They want almost every car and van to be zero emission by 2050, and will invest £600 million to achieve it by 2020. You can read about their policies on NOX emissions in a later article in this newsletter.

- Rail capacity will be increased (but the specifics are lacking).

- They oppose the proposed new Thames Crossing at Thurrock and would move it further east through Canvey Island.

- They would encourage zero emission vehicles by providing more supporting infrastructure.

- They would prevent diesel vehicle owners from being penalised through higher taxes and parking fines, but they support a diesel scrappage scheme and incentives for diesel vehicle owners to exchange them for electric or hybrid models.

- They do not support the expansion of Heathrow Airport and would encourage the growth of smaller regional airports (such as development of Manston in Kent).



- More money to support cycle networks and cycle parking at railway stations will be provided. (How much? It does not say).

Yes that seems to be about it.

Labour ("For the Many, Not the Few"). As one might expect, the Labour Party has a strong commitment to invest more in infrastructure, communications and energy systems. That includes:

- Completion of HS2 to Leeds/ Manchester and then on to Scotland.

- A new Brighton Main Line; build Crossrail 2 in London; and bring the railways back into public ownership (i.e. renationalise them).

Continued in next page.



Party Manifestos (Cont.)

- Labour will cap public transport fares, introduce free Wi-Fi across the rail network and stop driver-only operation of trains.
- They will support investment in low emission vehicles.
- On airport capacity in the South-East, they “welcome the work done by the Airports Commission” and don’t seem to rule out expansion of Heathrow if noise and air quality issues “can be addressed”.
- They will “refocus” the roads building and maintenance programmes on “connecting communities” and “feeding public transport hubs”.

Instead they want to improve regional airports.

- Design cities as safe and attractive walking spaces.

To summarise therefore, all the parties support the promotion of zero emission (electric) vehicles.

They all support more rail capacity in one form or another, but only UKIP would specifically cancel HS2. UKIP is “against” more things as one might expect from a populist protest party whereas the Conservatives have gone more for a “positive vision” with lots of the written equivalents of “sound-bites” using words such as “strong”, “stable” and “prosperous”.

Actually interpreting what these fine words will mean in practice can be more difficult.

- There will be a stronger focus on road safety improvement targets with “bold measures” to improve safety standards.

How some of this programme might be funded I will leave others to comment on. Labour obviously intends to raise taxes to pay for their programme, but some commentators have suggested both the Tory and Labour financial projections are unrealistic.

Yes you can tell it’s a General Election can’t you.

Liberal Democrat (“Change Britain’s Future”). The Liberal Democrats focus on “clean air and green transport”. Specifics include:

- Support for a diesel scrappage scheme and encouragement of the swift take-up of electric and driverless vehicles.

The Labour and LibDem manifestos are very much in their traditional mode and hence might appeal more to their existing supporters than others.

The impact of any party which might win the national election might be limited in London though as the Mayor is very much a dictator and can introduce his own policies and taxation (disguised as “charges”) to a great extent. Perhaps it might be better to have a right-wing central Government to control the excesses of a left-leaning Mayor (look at some of the quite disastrous changes under Livingstone). But no doubt readers can all make their own minds up after reading the manifestos which are all available on the web.

- Extending Ultra Low Emission Zones (ULEZs) to ten more cities.

- All PHVs and buses in urban areas to run on ultra low or zero emission fuels within 5 years.

- Reform of vehicle taxation to encourage electric and low emission vehicles.

- Establish Government run companies to take over Southern Rail and Govia Thameslink due to severe failings of existing franchisees.

- Proceed with HS2, HS3 and Crossrail 2.

- Support the takeover of metro services in London by London Overground.

- They are opposed to expansion of Heathrow, Stansted or Gatwick.



Follow the Blog

The ABD London region has a blog where many of the articles herein first appeared. It is present here:

<https://abdondon.wordpress.com/>

Please post your comments on the articles there (or of course send an email to the editor).

Note that articles on topical news are posted there first although they will continue to be summarised in this newsletter.

You can register to “follow” the blog so you get notified of any new articles as they appear.



Air Pollution and the ULEZ – More Information

The revised ULEZ proposals are subject to a public consultation which closes on June the 25th. I made some initial comments on them in the last ABD London Newsletter

The intention was to provide some more comments after I had obtained more information on the costs and benefits of the proposals from Transport for London (TfL). So after no initial response from TfL I submitted an FOI ACT request which included this question:

“Could you please also provide the costs of implementing the ULEZ (i.e. the capital cost) and the other proposals and the revenue and profits, i.e. surplus over operating costs in future years, forecast to be obtained by TfL as a result”.

This request was refused on the grounds of commerciality sensitivity. I have disputed that rejection on the basis that it is of major public interest to know that information before people respond to the consultation, and also that as this request was handled under the Environmental Information Regulations it is not a valid cause for rejection.

It will now go to an internal TfL review and after that probably to a complaint to the Information Commissioners Office.



But the outcome of these appeals will not probably be known until after the date of the consultation is closed.

Certainly that is likely to be too late to educate the population of London on the facts before they respond. In effect, we have a very dubious concealment of the cost/benefits of the proposals and how much profit the Mayor and TfL might generate from this new regime.



But here are some further comments based on what information is available in the current consultation documents.

It suggests that there would be a 30% saving in NOX emissions in central London in 2019 by bringing forward the ULEZ proposals.

Most of the savings would come from HGVs and buses, plus to a lesser extent from vans. Emissions from cars would only reduce by 8%. The major reduction would be in central London, but there would also be benefits in inner and outer London due to trips extending to/from those areas and the change to the vehicle fleet encouraged by the ULEZ rules.

There would also be reductions in PM10 and PM2.5 (particulate) emissions, particularly the latter.

But these are still relatively small – for example a 7% reduction from cars in central London, and only 2% across the GLA area.

The document does give some indication on the “damage cost savings” that might result. This is the savings on the calculated costs of the current level of pollution.

These could be as high as £15.8 million in central London to as low as £10 million. They give a mid-point estimate of £28 million for the whole GLA area. They provide very little information on how those figures have been calculated. But without knowing the cost of the ULEZ scheme to the road users and the required TfL infrastructure, plus their running costs, it is impossible to say whether there is any overall benefit to the population.

In addition, please note the relatively low benefit from including cars of any kind within the ULEZ proposals.

In my view, these proposals are out of proportion to the benefit to be obtained, at least so far as the impact on car owners and drivers are concerned. The fact that TfL are apparently reluctant to disclose the financial budgets for this scheme suggests to me that it is more about tax raising than simply tackling the air pollution health issue.

So if you will be affected, please respond to the consultation which is available from the link below. PLEASE MAKE SURE YOU RESPOND AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

Roger Lawson

Consultation: <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/airquality-consultation>

UK Air Quality Plan

On the 5th May the Government published a Revised Air Quality Plan to tackle NOX emissions, in response to breaches of EU legal limits. It may affect plans to control air pollution in London, but London Mayor Sadiq Khan promptly slammed it in the Evening Standard as being “woefully inadequate”. He argued it was a public health emergency and criticised the Government for being unwilling to take bold action. He is of course moving aggressively forward himself with the ULEZ plans.

What does the Government’s document actually say? It correctly argues that air pollution can come from a range of different sources, not just transport.

They have no real road safety benefits if you take into account traffic diversion while they have a number of dis-benefits. Increased air pollution is one well known aspect.

The Government argues that Clean Air Zones should only include charging arrangements where there is no other alternative – again Mr Khan is not taking much notice of this.

The Government mentions the possibility of a diesel vehicle scrappage scheme but suggests that it would need to be closely targeted, limited in scope, provide value for money and minimise the risk of fraud.

Author’s comments: Somehow I don’t think my 4 year old diesel Jaguar XF is going to be covered under any such scheme.

However as regards NOX it does exceed legal limits on some roads and diesel vehicles are one of the main causes.

It points out that although emissions have been falling, driven by Euro Standards for new vehicles, these measures were side-stepped by the fact that “real world” emissions did not match the test figures. In some cases, e.g. Volkswagen, they were deliberately manipulated to give erroneous data for diesel emissions. This is why there is still a major problem with diesel vehicles and high air pollution.

As it says: *“None of this is the fault of those who chose to buy diesel vehicles and as we tackle this problem, these same people should not be penalised for decisions they made in good faith”*. Mr Khan is ignoring that though.

And I won’t be able to claim dire poverty or some other excuse for a Government subsidy. So I might have a very hefty bill to replace it well before I otherwise would due to the ULEZ impact.

Motor manufacturers welcomed the Government’s proposals – perhaps because they see the opportunity to sell more vehicles to those being forced to replace them. Others were more critical and an RAC spokesperson said it possibly gave the green light to enable lots of local authorities to introduce charging schemes.

In summary, it seems diesel vehicles will be discouraged by higher taxation and discouraged in other ways also. The day of the all electric vehicle is surely coming closer, while even petrol car sales may start to decline.



The Government is committed to provide incentives and the adoption of policies that will clean up the vehicle fleet. It also argues that as air pollution is often a localized problem one approach should be the introduction of Clean Air Zones that could introduce control of the worst polluting vehicles (in essence HGVs and buses). They also want to encourage the take up of Ultra Low Emission Vehicles (e.g. electric ones).

One measure they suggest would help in addition to generally improving and smoothing traffic flows, might be the removal of road humps.

Now that would be a great step forward so far as this writer is concerned – I have repeatedly campaigned against them for the last twenty years.



Air Pollution, Oxford Street Buses and Nanoparticles

The Government wished to delay publication of its revised UK Air Quality Plan until after the General Election but after a legal challenge it was forced to publish it. See previous article for some analysis of it. London Mayor Sadiq Khan promptly slammed the proposals as “woefully inadequate” before he could have barely had time to read the full document (air pollution is a technically complex matter and it is necessary to read the whole document and the supporting evidence).

Continued on next page.



Oxford Street Buses (Cont.)

In the Evening Standard Mr Khan said:

"I welcome that the government has agreed to consult on introducing a targeted diesel scrapage fund, as I have modelled, to help drivers who bought diesel vehicles in good faith.

However, the government has failed to give a firm commitment and, even if it goes ahead, this alone would go nowhere near fixing the problem. City Hall analysis shows that the proposals still mean air quality will be at illegal levels until at least 2026."

In the meantime Transport for London (TfL) has taken steps to reduce pollution on Oxford Street (which is one of the worst locations in London) by introducing proposals to cut the number of buses by 40%.

TfL says bus numbers can be reduced because of higher underground frequencies and the new Crossrail service which will open in December 2018. There is a public consultation on this topic on the web if you have an interest in this subject.

Editors Comments: it is undoubtedly the case that the number of buses on Oxford Street not only makes it a very unpleasant street for pedestrians but also creates road safety dangers.



Current diesel buses are of course some of the worse emitters of air pollution. Whether the proposals will improve matters substantially is not at all clear.

Another step to improve air pollution in London is the introduction of rapid electric vehicle charging points. TfL has appointed five suppliers to build such a network.



These charge points can recharge a vehicle battery in 30 minutes and the plan is to have 300 installed by 2020, although some will be dedicated for use by taxis. All new London taxis must be zero-emission by January 2018.

The latest environmental scare story is the impact of nanoparticles on human health. An article in the New Scientist reported that these microscopic particles can enter the blood stream and they can remain there for over 3 months. The impact they have on health was unknown but the hypothesis given was that they could be having a major impact. In effect the article suggested that we might need to worry not so much about Nitrous Oxides or larger particulates, but about nanoparticles from vehicle pollution.

Nanoparticles are quite difficult to detect, but it is known that they are present everywhere.

Indeed normal activities in the home, business activities and certainly industrial activities give off large amounts of nanoparticles which are simply invisible.

A very interesting article in the Financial Times on the 29th April explained how our homes can actually be one of the most polluted locations, often worse than the air outside even in the worst polluted cities. It said "A study published in the *European Respiratory Journal* in 2012 showed that concentrations of some air pollutants can be up to five times higher indoors than outdoors". As we spend 90% of our time indoors, versus 10% outdoors, this is of concern.

Cooking on gas, food cooking emissions, dog hairs, dead skin particles, lint particles from tumble dryers, deodorant sprays and scented candles were all named as culprits.

Log burning stoves are a particular problem which have become popular even in London of late. The solution is apparently to purchase an electric air purifier.

In summary, pollution is everywhere and always has been. Even green fields and trees can be a menace because of pollens and dust. Indeed I do recall reading a study many years ago that showed the prevalence of asthma was more common in rural areas than in cities.

So it's easy to become paranoid about air pollution. It's necessary to separate fact from fiction so that the picture is clear about which pollutants are of real concern and which are not. Otherwise we will get lost in a fog of hysteria.



Bank Junction Closed to Most Traffic

On the 22nd May, Bank Junction in the City of London was closed to most vehicles. Only buses and cyclists are now permitted between 7.00 am and 7.00 pm.

It was very amusing watching a BBC reporter talking about this on the Monday evening news with the background of the junction in view – and clearly many vehicles were either not aware of the new restriction or were ignoring it. The infringers face a large fine, although there may be 2 week grace period apparently where warnings only will be issued.

But surely it will take a lot longer than that for satnavs to be updated?

On Tuesday it was similar as you can see from the photo to the right – just one example of many seen in just a few minutes.



The measure has certainly reduced traffic congestion at and around this junction, but of course spreads it elsewhere. Whether it will reduce accidents at this location remains to be seen. Cyclists and buses now speed through the junction.

A much more substantial revision of the junction is surely required. The ABD did object to this closure as did taxi drivers. It's one of the key road junctions in the City of London and there were other alternatives to simplify this complex junction and reduce accidents.

The Rise of Non-Travel

We all know that travelling in London has become more difficult in the last few years. Rising traffic congestion due to reductions in road space and cycle superhighways, and overcrowded public transport, have been very damaging. Population increase, and more business activity, have not been supported fully by new transport infrastructure and there has been little long-term planning or funding to improve the transport network.

Now Transport for London (TfL) has confirmed that travelling is now so difficult in London that the number of Londoners who spend all day at home has been rising.

To quote (from LTT): *"In particular, there has been a rise in non-travel, in other words, people*

staying at home all day and not making any trips". It seems on any given day, around 20% of Londoners do not make any journeys nowadays.

It seems likely that there has been a reduction in travel for shopping purposes (hence the increase in van deliveries resulting from internet shopping). But there are more people probably working from home and using the internet and other communication media rather than going into a conventional workplace every day. Also of course the increase in the elderly might explain the rise in non-travel, although many retired people move out of London.

New Cycling and Walking Commissioner

One other influence over future travel patterns may be a new "Cycling and Walking Commissioner" named Will Norman.

Former Cycling Commissioner Andrew Gilligan has suggested the change of name for the role might indicate that Mayor Khan might have more interest in walking than cycling, particularly as some previously approved cycling schemes do not seem to be progressing. He also suggested that the Mayor wishes to avoid confrontation with the motoring lobby. But that surely seems very unlikely bearing in mind the Mayor's plans over air pollution.

Healthy Streets

TfL have recently published a document named "Improving the health of Londoners—Transport Action Plan". It gives more information on recent travel patterns and how TfL is going to get us all taking more exercise. It's well worth reading to get an idea of likely future trends and policies.



Reader's Letter

TfL and an Interesting Court Case

Here is a letter received from one of our supporters which shows how difficult it can be to deal with Transport for London (TfL):

Dear Roger

I have an electric car that's registered with Transport for London as an ULEV (ultra low emissions vehicle) and therefore exempt from the Congestion Charge. The car is driven into the Congestion Zone every day.

Last December, out of the blue, the car was issued by post with 11 PCNs for entering the congestion zone on 11 consecutive days without payment of the c-charge.

In the meantime they had cancelled all the 11 PCNs. After several of my demands for payment were refused, I decided to sue Transport for London for £60 in the small claims court. My claim was not defended, so I obtained a County Court Judgment by default against TfL. They still failed to pay, so I issued a warrant of execution, instructing bailiffs to visit their head office. By this time my claim had grown to £162 to include court fees. The bailiffs paid their visit and obtained a cheque from TfL, which included my £162 plus their fees (unknown).

I should imagine, therefore, that this whole episode has cost TfL something in the region of £400, instead of £60, because of their stupidity. And who eventually foots the bill for this incredible waste of money? You guessed it, you and me, the taxpayer.
Danny Michelson

It appeared that the car's registration, which has to be renewed annually, had lapsed.

TfL have to send a reminder by email to renew about a month before it expires, but on phoning the Congestion Charge office I was informed that there was a fault with their system and a reminder did not go out. They advised me to appeal against the PCNs, which I did.

I had phoned them in the week in between Christmas and new year, when there is no congestion charging. The C-Charge was starting again the following week on 2 January, so I asked them if the car's registration could be renewed straight away to prevent any further PCNs being issued from 2 January.

Editor's Comments: This is unfortunately typical of the problems faced by road users when there is any charging system. Similar problems of administrative incompetence such as duplicate payments have been reported on the Dartford Crossing which uses a similar system of number plate recognition cameras.

Permit Parking Charges in Lambeth

The London Borough of Lambeth are proposing to implement additional permit parking charges for diesel cars that do not meet the Euro 6 standard – that means all of them that are more than a few years old. The additional charge will be £40 per year.

They said no, there would be a delay in doing this because of continuing problems with their system. They said I should pay the Congestion Charge for a few days in advance to avoid getting any more PCNs, and the money would be refunded to me when the renewal was eventually done.

I therefore paid a C-Charge of £71.50 to cover the following week up to 9 January, and on that day the registration was renewed. I then asked for a refund, but to my amazement they said they would only refund me £11.50 for 9 January, as a goodwill gesture, because that was the day the car had become re-registered. In spite of their previous promise, they now said I was not eligible to be refunded the remaining £60.



The ABD has sent in objections simply on the grounds that this is a political gesture that will have minimal impact on air pollution in the borough, or is motivated by a desire to raise revenue for the Council.

A similar calculation recently for Merton showed that the impact might be a reduction of 0.4% in overall NOX emissions which is too small to be measurable in practice. In addition, as clearly there will be additional revenue raised for council budgets, without any offsetting reduction in charges for other vehicles, this change is effectively a revenue raising measure and hence illegal. It has been established by more than one legal precedent that permit parking charges cannot be used to raise revenue but can only cover administration and enforcement costs.



Survey Results -The Big Issues Highlighted

A few weeks ago we issued a survey to folks who receive the ABD London Newsletter. Thanks to all those who responded and here is a brief summary of the results.

Most respondents read every issue, but 58% of respondents were not aware of the ABD London Blog where news first appears (the newsletter is basically a summary of the news over the previous two months with some additional longer articles). You can find the ABD London Blog here:
<https://abdondon.wordpress.com/>

You can "follow" it by clicking on the page at the bottom right - you will then be sent an email when new stories appear.

One question asked was which campaigns would readers support on some topical issues. The highest score here was 96% against wide area 20 mph speed limits, and bear in mind that not all of our newsletter readers are ABD members. Second most popular was campaigns against excessive parking charges (87%), followed by opposition to Congestion Charging (79%), ULEZ proposals (71%) and attacks on diesel vehicles (71%).

Written in suggestions in response to that question included the failure to repair potholes, the need for an independent Road Accident

Investigation Board, opposition to CPZs and their extension, against Sustrans sponsored Quietways, against average speed cameras and illegally constructed speed humps.

Our newsletter readers are predominantly male (85%) and relatively elderly (76% over 55) but only 36% classified themselves as "retired".

As regards improving the Newsletter, there were a number of comments saying "it is fine as it is", but there was also encouragement to use social media some more. We will see what we can do on the latter point.

Roger Lawson



Croydon 20 - Pushing Ahead Regardless of Objections

Croydon Council are pushing ahead with implementing wide-area, signed-only 20 MPH speed limits in the rest of the borough despite enormous numbers of objections.

The consultation process on Area 1 was clearly subject to fraud, and on Area 2 the vote in favour narrowed very substantially.

So for areas 3, 4 and 5, which by their nature were more likely to oppose the proposal, they abandoned the previous consultation process and moved straight to a "statutory consultation".

That meant people had to take the trouble to write in with specific objections rather than simply respond to an on-line poll. The other advantage of that change is that objections to statutory consultations can be ignored so long as the council simply gives reasons to do so.

Was this process ethical?
Absolutely not.

And what was the result of the formal statutory consultation on Areas 3, 4 and 5? They got 3,357 representations in total from 2,050 individuals, but only 103 of the representations were in support of the proposals. In detail there were a total of 18,862 objections of different kinds.

These numbers are enormous for such a relatively small geographic area.

But are the Councillors and Council Officers going to reconsider? Absolutely not. A typical example of how dogma and policy decisions overrides the will of the people in some councils.

The recommendation in a report to the Traffic Management Advisory Committee was to proceed regardless. The Meeting of that Committee on the 9th May agreed that recommendation.

The decision has been "called in" for a Scrutiny Committee by some Conservative Councillors but there seems little chance of defeating it bearing in mind the Labour control of the Council. But a legal challenge is being considered by local resident Peter Morgan.

Continued on next page.



Croydon 20 (Continued).

Editor's Comments: The next time there is a vote for local Councillors, just bear in mind which Councillors and which political party (the Labour Party) have taken this stance in Croydon.

The last time I saw this ignoring of the electorate take place was in the London Borough of Richmond where the LibDems pushed through an emission based permit parking scheme against strong public opposition. They were subsequently removed from control of the Council by popular vote. And a very good thing that was too.

You can see more about the scheme in Croydon on the web page given below. The ABD did make written submissions on these schemes including on the latest 3 areas.

The report from Croydon Council does not adequately deal with all the objections, and in some regards is grossly misleading. For example, in Para 3.1.8 it says Manchester reported falls in cyclist and pedestrian casualties in 20 mph zones but due to the average speed reduction being only 0.7mph the further roll-out was being halted. In actual fact what Manchester City Council actually said (you can find their report on the web) was:

"Overall the results show that casualties in the phase 1 20mph area have not reduced as much as the casualty numbers citywide". In other words, there was absolutely no benefit whatsoever in terms of casualties despite very high expenditure and if anything it made accident numbers worse. Both ethics and democracy have clearly be thrown out of the window in Croydon.

This is the kind of thing that the Alliance of British Drivers (ABD) has consistently opposed. If you are not already a member please consider joining - see last page of this newsletter for Membership Information.

Croydon 20 Campaign: <http://www.freedomfordrivers.org/Croydon20.htm>

20 MPH in Bath

The futility of signed only, wide area 20 mph schemes was highlighted in a report in Local Transport Today (LTT) on the results of a scheme in the City of Bath.

The local Council reported that the scheme delivered few benefits and there was no case for extending it. The Council had spent £871,000 between 2011 and 2016 imposing a 20 limit on 1,499 streets.

Traffic speeds only fell by 1.3 mph and although total accidents were down, the Killed and Seriously Injured (KSIs) were actually up. The latter figure is by far the most important as slight accident numbers are subject to under reporting and cannot be relied upon.



This compares very unfavourably with other central London boroughs who all achieved over 35% reductions with the best (Greenwich) achieving 55%. The pedestrian casualties went up in 2015 (23 serious accidents) although pedal cyclist numbers improved.

20 MPH in the City of London

Similar results to Bath were apparent in a recent report to the City of London Corporation on their "Road Danger Reduction Work Programme". It shows a dismal failure to meet targets for reducing road casualties in the City despite the introduction of a City wide 20 mph speed limit. In 2015 the number of KSIs were 43—down only 13% on their "baseline" set in 2004-08.

The failure to improve pedestrian numbers was assigned to increased numbers of workers in the City (14% up from 2013-15). On that basis they claim a "reduction in the risk of being injured on City streets". A lot of accidents to pedestrians in the City do of course arise from inattention, particularly at lunchtime. People crossing the road with mobile phones to their ear is a particular problem, or assuming possibly they do not need to pay as much attention as in the past with the new speed limit.





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 and fill out the box to be added to our mailing list.

Address Changes

Don't forget to notify the ABD of any change of postal or email addresses. You may otherwise miss out on future copies of this newsletter without noticing that they are no longer being delivered.

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

Contact and Publisher 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 anyone else who has an interest in traffic and transport issues in London. All material contained herein is Copyright of the A.B.D. or of the respective 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. The ABD London Region also publishes a blog which can be found here: <https://abdondon.wordpress.com/>



A.B.D. London Region Co-ordinator and Editor: Roger Lawson (Tel: 020-8295-0378, Email: 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 anyone with an interest in transport matters. Our internet web address is: www.freedomfordrivers.org (or 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. All past copies of our newsletters can be obtained from the www.freedomfordrivers.org web site.

Support the ABD by Becoming a Member

The Alliance of British Drivers (ABD) is a national organisation that promotes the interests of road users. For more information, see <http://www.abd.org.uk>. Membership information is present here: <http://www.abd.org.uk/membership>