



FFDF News

Freedom for Drivers Foundation Newsletter

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

In this Edition

- 15MPH Limits in London
- A New Money Making Wheeze
- Fines for Speeding Rising
- Speed Camera Racket
- Surge in Driving Fines
- LTNs Don't Work and Oxford
- H&F and Lambeth LTNs
- Fraudulent Traffic Counts
- Mayor Expands ULEZ
- Mayor's Strategy Failing
- Transport Disruptions
- FFDF Web Site
- Judicial Reviews
- Holborn Gyrotory
- Bromley Policies
- Profiting from Parking
- CPZs
- Letters to the Editor

See the last page for publisher and contact information.

Editorial

Christmas is a time to look back over the past year and thank god we have survived the Covid epidemic. But it's been a bleak outcome otherwise.

We have an energy crisis where some people are unable to heat their homes due to the price of energy rising rapidly. We have a cost of living crisis such that food and other basic essentials have risen in price at a pace not seen since the 1970s as inflation has grown out of control. To go along with these negative trends we have had political turmoil which has left the Conservative Government floundering.

They have been unable to control the flood of illegal immigrants and stop a few fanatics disrupting our roads in the name of saving us from global warming but while I sit here writing this it's a cool 1 degrees C outside.

It's all rather depressing is it not?

As regards the subjects we cover in our newsletters, the news has also been generally negative.

There have been more attacks on the use of vehicles with Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) spreading and schemes such as that proposed for Oxford (see page 5) that will restrict freedom of movement.

The Mayor of London has ignored the result of a public consultation and is expanding the ULEZ to the whole of London which will also affect those who live outside the capital. But the Government does nothing to restrain the dictatorship of Sadiq Khan.

On the whole public life has been dominated by trivia—the activities of the Royal family, the gender wars, racial prejudice and the antics of “celebrities”. Even the war in Ukraine which has killed tens of thousands has dropped out of the news while we have been on the brink of World War III.

Let us hope that the world returns to sanity in the New Year. It can't get worse.

Roger Lawson
(Editor)



Quotes of the Month

“Speeding enforcement should not become ‘fishing trips’ to secure money for councils”..... AA Spokesperson on Wandsworth 20 Limit Enforcement. See p. 2

“Councils that implemented low-traffic neighbourhoods during the pandemic have seen bigger increases in car use than boroughs that did not, according to government driving statistics”.....article in The Times. See p.5

“As a general rule, the Council will not install any new 20mph limit or zones. This is because the reduction in speed limitdoes not seem to have much effect on drivers’ speeds”...From Bromley Policies. See p.13





15 MPH Limits in London Blocked

A proposal from the City of London Corporation for 15 mph speed limits in the City has been blocked by central Government.

The Department for Transport (DfT) said it would be hard to enforce such a limit as not all cars have speedometers marked with 5 mph markings and speedometers are not accurate enough.

The City Corporation is still planning to put up 15 mph limit signs but they can legally be ignored.

Comment: This is an enormous waste of money as traffic in the City rarely exceeds 15 mph. At least someone in the DfT has some common sense.

Putting up signs would not have made any difference to road safety figures. But we still have Transport for London (TfL) imposing 20 mph speed limits on main roads in London which is slowing traffic and is totally unnecessary plus widely ignored.

Driving even at 20 mph consistently is not at all easy in modern cars so it's just another imposition on drivers by the cycling fanatics in TfL who seem to wish everyone slowed down to their speed.

There is no evidence that putting up 20 mph speed limit signs has any road safety benefit.

A New Money Making Wheeze for London Councils

The London Borough of Wandsworth has obtained permission to enforce 20 Mph speed limits by the use of PCN fines. This will be a trial scheme for 8 months using an Experimental Traffic Order. The money raised will go to the Council so



this is just another scam to extract money from motorists like the LTN cameras now being used.

Previously only the police could issue fines for speeding and the money then goes to the Government Treasury. Or the police could offer a speed awareness course which is a way they finance their own operations.

Wandsworth Council say that traffic studies found that one in four vehicles broke the speed limit in Priory Lane and one in five in Wimbledon Park Road. But that surely just demonstrates that a 20 limit is inappropriate for those roads or the roads need re-engineering. There is no evidence given of excessive road safety problems.

These were quotations given in the Evening Standard: "The AA has said that speeding should not be dealt with 'like a parking

ticket'. Speeding enforcement should not become "fishing trips" to secure money for councils," a spokesman told the Evening Standard. Drivers will be rightly concerned that speeding fines will be more about filling council coffers than keeping roads safe, Joe Ventre, from the TaxPayers' Alliance, also told the newspaper".

Residents of Wandsworth should submit objections to the Council but this scheme will undoubtedly spread to other boroughs if it is not opposed. It should never have been approved by central Government.

There is minimal information on this scheme on the Wandsworth Council web site and no Experimental Traffic Order related to it was obviously present on the London Registry as there should be so we submitted an FOI Act request to the Council.



The answers to my FOI request suggest that the Traffic Order was published in December 2021 in a local newspaper and in the London Gazette with only a few weeks allowed for objections, but not many people are likely to have read those sources. I am still looking into the legality of the Traffic Order.

Roger Lawson

Continued on next page.



We have submitted the following objection to the London Borough of Wandsworth:

Email address: TrafficAndEngineering@richmondandwandsworth.gov.uk

I refer to "The Wandsworth (Prescribed Routes) (20mph Speed Limit) Experimental Order 2021".

Please note our objections to this Order for the following reasons:

1. The 20-mph limit on the roads concerned is likely to have very little, if any, impact on road casualties. I quote from a recent article in the Daily Mail:

"Researchers from Queen's University Belfast, Edinburgh University and the University of Cambridge collected data on traffic collisions, casualties, driver

speed and traffic volume before a 20mph limit was introduced, as well as one and three years afterwards.

Their study encompassed 76 streets in the city centre, and they compared data with that collected from nearby streets where the restrictions did not apply. Analysis showed that when compared with the sites that had retained their speed limits, a 20mph speed limit was associated with little change in short or long-term accident statistics.

Small reductions in road traffic collisions of 3 per cent and 15 per cent, respectively, were observed one and three years after the policy took effect. But there was no statistically significant difference over time, the researchers said.

Similarly, casualty rates fell by 16 per cent and 22 per cent, respectively, one and three years after implementation - but these reductions also weren't statistically significant".

2. The above evidence is similar to what the DfT reported some years ago and you can read our comments on that here:

<https://tinyurl.com/35zyn278> .

Limits of 20 mph typically only reduce traffic speeds by 1 mph which is not noticeable in practice.

3. The roads on which you are enforcing the 20 limit are inappropriate for a 20 limit. For example Wimbledon Park Road is a straight and relatively wide road which drivers will not perceive as needing a 20 limit. Is there really a road safety problem in this road?



4. The ability of the Council to enforce such a limit via the issue of PCNs rather than have police pursue a prosecution suggests the motive for the scheme is to enable the Council to collect money from fines rather than to improve road safety.

5. We have studied the relevant Acts of Parliament referred to in the TMO and we cannot see that they enable enforcement of the 20 limit in this way by Wandsworth Council. London Councils certainly have powers to enforce parking restrictions, road closures and certain other traffic offences but we do not see that this extends to 20-mph speed limits. Please point out exactly which provisions in those Acts are being relied upon.

P.S. We are still looking into the legality of the enforcement of 20 limits by Wandsworth Council.

We suggest anyone interested in this matter submits similar objections to the Council.



Fines for Speeding Rising Rapidly

The Times have published an article headlined "Police veering wildly on 20 mph limit" which covers the variation in speed enforcement across the country.

In London fines have been rising rapidly as the Metropolitan Police have doubled patrols in 20 mph zones and have a target to enforce against one million drivers. But in other parts of the country the number of 20 mph speeding offences is minimal.

London taxi drivers, known to be some of the safest drivers on the roads, have been badly hit particularly after the previous excess tolerance was reduced by 1 mph.

Continued on next page.



Fines for Speeding (Cont.)

The Licensed Taxi Drivers Association said they had been inundated with requests for legal assistance from drivers with previously clean licences, given penalty points for breaching a 20 mph limit.

Lilli Matson, who oversees the “Vision Zero” strategy for Transport for London (TfL), is quoted in the Times article as saying “the fines went to the Treasury and no profits were taken from speed awareness courses”. This is grossly misleading. Police forces generate surpluses from such courses which they spend on all sorts of things including more cameras.

See our Ampow campaign for more evidence on this at: <https://tinyurl.com/mrxtm7fm>

Comment: Having a target for offences identified and prosecuted is wrong. It incentivises the police to find offences that may have no relevance to road safety while there is no evidence that taking a speed awareness course improves a driver’s safety. It’s just another perverse attack on motorists, particularly in London pursued by TfL, where 20 mph limits are now being installed on main roads. See link below on how Vision Zero is failing to achieve any improvement in road casualty statistics mainly because there is an irrational belief that cutting traffic speed will help.

Vision Zero failing: <https://tinyurl.com/tz763fcd>

Speed Camera Racket and HS2 Costs

The Daily Telegraph published a couple of good articles on 13/11/2022. The first is entitled “The Great Speed-Camera Racket” and covers how 1.74 million drivers were caught speeding by cameras last year and forked out almost £46 million in fines.

The author describes how it is so easy to miss the new 20 mph limits in London and includes this comment: “If only speed limits were the end of it. But they’re not. Blundering into ever-expanding low-traffic neighbourhoods (fine), congestion zones (fine) or emissions zones (fine); bus lanes that suddenly rear out of the side of the road (fine); yellow box



junctions set up like fiendish games of chance (fine) – it can all seem like a confusing, infuriating lottery in reverse. Instead of low odds you’ll win, there are high odds you’ll lose. Single streets – like Lansdowne Drive in Hackney – have earned councils more than £1m in just a few months”.

According to AA President Edmond King: “Most scandalous of all is a yellow box junction on Bagleys Lane and New King’s Road in SW6 where drivers cannot see if the exit is clear before entering the dreaded cross-hatched area”.

Comment: Certainly speed cameras, yellow box junctions and all the other restrictions on drivers are there to raise money and there is no evidence that they improve road safety. Road casualties in the last ten years in the UK have only fallen slightly and the reduction can be

explained by better vehicle design, improved roads (with accident black spots being treated) and improved medical treatments.

There is no justification for all the expensive enforcement action that is now deployed with people innocent of any criminal intent being pursued.

The other good article was on the cost of HS2. To quote from it: “HS2 will cost taxpayers more than the benefits it will deliver, the Government has admitted for the first time. Analysis conducted by civil servants found that the rail project will now deliver just 90 pence in economic benefit for every £1 it costs, raising fresh questions about its existence ahead of this week’s Autumn Statement”.

Comment: We have always opposed the construction of HS2 because it was never justified on

a cost/benefit analysis and that was before construction costs ballooned to unaffordable levels.

It was always a white elephant that benefits mainly wealthy Londoners while ridership figures are hopelessly optimistic. The money would be better spent on other projects and at present the country simply cannot afford over £100 billion on such vanity projects that are also environmentally damaging. It is not too late to cancel this project.

Roger Lawson



Surge in Driving Fines

The London Evening Standard have reported that there has been a big surge in driving fines fuelled by the increase in Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs). Some 7.4 million PCNs were issued in London last year – an increase of 41% on the prior year.

There are only 2.6 million cars registered in London so you can see that the number of PCNs issued per vehicle is very high even allowing for some PCNs being issued to drivers from outside the London area. These enormous numbers of PCNs are of course now being caused by the desire of some local councils to raise money from fines by installing camera systems to monitor LTNs and School Streets.

Boroughs such as Islington, Hackney and Lambeth are the

It said “Councils that implemented low-traffic neighbourhoods during the pandemic have seen bigger increases in car use than boroughs that did not, according to government driving statistics”.

The explanation is probably that when roads are closed off the displaced traffic simply takes longer routes and hence does more miles.

Meanwhile in Oxford a group called “Reconnecting Oxford” which represents several campaigns is mounting a legal challenge against the existing LTN and raising money for the fight – see <https://tinyurl.com/3nfc8xf> and here: <https://tinyurl.com/ykh627fp>

But the Council is fighting back with plans to divide the city into

leaders in this unethical practice. But Transport for London (TfL) themselves issued 329,000 fines for infringement of bus lanes, yellow box junctions and other moving traffic offences.

The Covid epidemic was used as an excuse to implement LTNs without prior public consultation as temporary measures but have been made permanent as councils realised how much money they could extract from motorists using camera systems.

Photo above is of Manor Park in Lewisham, one of the Councils who have been raking in large sums from camera enforcement of LTNs.



LTNs Don't Work and Lunacy in Oxford

An article in The Times on 24/10/2022 showed LTNs don't work under the headline “London LTNs: Councils that closed rat runs now have even more cars on the road”.



H&F and Lambeth LTNs Expanding

The London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham are planning many more traffic restrictions all over the borough. See: <https://tinyurl.com/8p3y9s4j> (details in item 4).

It's in the name of creating “Clean Air Neighbourhoods”, but it includes such nonsense as “It will repurpose street space to be used by the community for play streets, community theatre and resident-led events such as street parties”. Roads are for transporting people and goods, not for playing in.



Continued on next page.



six districts with strict rules on how often motorists can drive outside their neighbourhood. Everybody who owns a car would need a permit and if they drive into an adjacent district more than a few times per year they would get fined.

This must be one of the most extreme anti-car measures implemented anywhere.

A YouGov poll suggests that most people support these measures. But like all such polls the questions posed are misleading. Most people, including car drivers, would like less traffic but they are opposed to closing roads, particularly the ones they use.

Roger Lawson





LTNs Expanding (Cont.)

The report claims that “Long term exposure to man-made air pollution in the UK has an estimated annual effect equivalent to 28,000-36,000 deaths”. This is simply a lie. In addition decisions

are being delegated on this to council officers so there will be no democratic input on the details or prior consultation before they are imposed. The crucial words “traffic access restrictions” are buried in a list of measures under the totally misleading title of “Clean Air Neighbourhoods Programme”.

It is gridlock by stealth and every ward is affected.

The good people of south Fulham have been, quite justifiably, protesting and have approaching 5,000 signatures on a petition which is here: <https://tinyurl.com/2dbxcjnc> . PLEASE SIGN IT!

London Borough of Lambeth

Lambeth Council will make an investment of over £16 million to encourage residents to give up their cars and make sustainable travel choices. This is part of an “Air Quality Action Plan” (see <https://tinyurl.com/54skue6p>).

It includes a comment that “Each year in Lambeth air pollution kills more than 100 Lambeth residents and causes hundreds of hospital admissions”. How do they know? There is no link between deaths from respiratory diseases or hospital admissions and background air pollution from man-made sources or any others.



The plans include protected cycle lanes, more bike storage facilities, new walking routes, more electric vehicle charge points and implementation of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs). Make sure you respond to the above consultation and oppose LTNs.

Islington has already implemented similar policies to the anger of many locals. It is reported that someone who lives there and had a simple journey to take her elderly mother to regular medical treatment now takes an hour, when it used to take 10 minutes!

After school activities are rendered impossible. Cab drivers won't go there and established local businesses have been forced to close.

It's worth pointing out that all these LTN schemes typically enable the local councils to

generate cash from fines on infringements. They are mainly about profit generation and hence the incredible claims made about the impacts of air pollution.

Fraudulent Traffic Counts and Enfield LTN

The following article has been written by Michael De Haan, a local resident of Ealing.

Do people enjoy being deceived by Enfield Council? It turns out that the traffic surveys done by Enfield for their post LTN data applied a filter so that it did not count any vehicles moving at less than 10km per hour. The individual road reports show not a single vehicle on any road doing less than this speed.

Given the congestion introduced by the LTNs this is highly unlikely. This means that the figure quoted for the percentage increase in traffic on the boundary roads should be close to double that reported in the Fox Lane Final Report.

These falsely low figures were also the ones used to generate the pollution models. I have been in contact with the manufacturers of the equipment used (MetroCount) and they say the equipment, which relies on two rubber tubes strung across the road, is recommended to only be used in FREE FLOWING traffic.

When you introduce congestion, and vehicles stop with their wheels between or bridging the tubes, or they do not travel over the tubes fast enough, the vehicles are simply not counted.

Continued on next page.



Fraudulent Traffic Counts (Cont.)

Preparing a report with a 10km filter from this raw data increases the number of vehicles not counted. In severe congestion, where cars only shuffle forwards a couple of car lengths at a time you will not count 25% of the cars (that's one in every four).

Even in milder congestion where cars move forwards 10 car lengths at a time you will miss 5% of vehicles (one in every 20).

On 6th July 2021 Transport Survey Systems, the company employed by Enfield Council, did what are known as "Turning Surveys" at four junctions on four of the Fox Lane LTN boundary roads. These surveys video the traffic for 12hrs and the number of vehicles are manually counted.

This was during a week when the same company were also surveying the same roads with the Automatic Traffic Count (ATC) tubes. By comparing the data you can show the ATC tubes didn't count nearly 3000 vehicles that were manually counted over the 12hr period.

This represents 5.4% of the total traffic over this 12hr period that was simply NOT COUNTED. As there was an hourly breakdown of the figures you can show the number of missed vehicles increases in direct proportion to the level of congestion.

Nearly all surveying of LTNs over London use this method. If there is little or no congestion at the count points, pre LTN, the number of vehicles counted will be fairly accurate. If the LTN creates congestion at the count points then the post LTN survey will simply not count a proportion of the vehicles.

Maybe this is what is meant by traffic evaporation?

Editor's Comment: It is well known that measuring traffic congestion based on traffic counts is a defective method. The only safe way to measure traffic congestion is to time a trip when there are no significant delays (e.g. in the middle of the night) and compare it to the travel time in busier periods. To allow for odd incidents or delays, the average of several trips needs to be taken. This was the method used by TfL when initially reporting on the effect of the Congestion Charge.

That showed that there was no benefit in the Congestion Charge in terms of reduced congestion and TfL subsequently ceased publishing similar reports for obvious reasons.



Mayor Ignores Consultation and Expands ULEZ

Sadiq Khan has issued a statement via TfL confirming that he is expanding the ULEZ to the whole of London in August 2023. Any owners of non-compliant cars will be paying £12.50 per day, every day. This decision is despite the fact that it will have minimal impact on air pollution in London and that a major proportion of London residents oppose the change.

The Mayor has announced a scrappage scheme for some people (the disabled and those on means-tested benefits plus small businesses) but in reality very few people are likely to qualify for this support and it is unlikely to cover all the costs of changing vehicles.

The big danger is once the scheme is introduced with new cameras everywhere to enforce it the Mayor could decide to charge all vehicles driving in London

Follow us on Twitter

To get the latest news and comment on traffic and transport issues in London and the UK, you can follow us on Twitter.

Our Twitter handle is **@Drivers_London**

Any new FFDF blog posts are notified by Twitter and you can of course respond with your own comments.

which he has always wanted to do. YOU HAVE BEEN WARNED! The only way this move can be stopped is if the Government removes Sadiq Khan from power, or removes his ability to make these kinds of decisions.



ULEZ Expansion (Cont.)

Please write to your M.P. on this – go to this web site to do that easily:

<https://www.writetothem.com/> .

DO IT NOW!

More Comments on ULEZ Expansion

Following Sadiq Khan's decision to expand the ULEZ to the whole of London I have had the time to read the whole report (all 300 pages of it) on which he based his decision – see link below.

These are my comments on it:

Our objections were mentioned but were rejected with a trivial comment, along with all the other

paign, London Friends of the Earth Network and Wearepossible.org. The last one generated 4,312 emails, more than any other source, and who are they you may ask? Wearepossible.org are a part of the 10:10 Foundation, a Charitable Incorporated Organisation, with very substantial financial support from a hedge fund. Their objective is to achieve a zero-carbon world and their chairperson is an academic focussed on climate change. So much for the complaint of one MP that the consultation was being biased by pro motoring organisations – the exact opposite is the truth.

Many respondents seemed to think it was a consultation on responding to climate change with 37% of respondents saying it was Very Important to take steps to tackle climate change when the ULEZ proposal cannot have any impact on climate change as it will not affect CO2 emissions.

objections from other people and organisations.

The Mayor justifies his decision because of his commitment to have 80% of all trips in London to be made by foot, by cycle or using public transport by 2041. He also wants to go further to reduce air pollution, tackle the climate emergency and reduce traffic congestion. **Comment:** As already pointed out, the expanded ULEZ will have minimal impact on air pollution and will certainly have no impact on the climate or reduce traffic congestion (only a minority of vehicles are affected and their owners will just switch to newer models).

The Mayor alleges that there are 4,000 premature deaths in outer London caused by air pollution including 204 in Bromley, 201 in Barnet, 196 in Croydon, etc.

It is noticeable that a large proportion of the responses came from central London addresses, i.e. from people who will not be affected by the ULEZ expansion in any way. In summary there was a concerted effort by environmental activists to distort the consultation.

An article in the Daily Express suggests there will be a massive drop in used car values based on a report by Carwow. There are about 200,000 non-compliant cars that regularly drive into the affected area it notes and these will likely be sold in the next eighteen months so that drivers avoid paying over £2,000 per year to Sadiq Khan. There is still a market for such vehicles in other parts of the country but prices may be substantially affected.

What's our advice to those who own non-compliant cars? Don't panic. Running an existing vehicle until next August will reduce the impact and there may be an immediate rush by some

These are simply estimates and bear no relation to reality. It's ignoring the fact that outer London boroughs have less air pollution and low rates of most diseases but they do have older populations as people move out of central London to the suburbs as they grow their families or retire.

The consultation results show overwhelming opposition to the ULEZ Expansion: 68% of respondents (when organised responses are excluded), 70% of outer London, 80% of people who work in outer London, 80% of outer London businesses. There were a number of "organised" responses to the consultation. Apart from ones we encouraged there were ones directly promoted by Fair Fuel UK, Living Streets, London Cycling Cam-



sellers that will temporarily depress prices further which already reflect the anticipated decision. For those who only use a vehicle occasionally it might be more cost effective to retain it rather than buy a new vehicle. There is always a chance that the implementation will be delayed or cancelled. There is a move by some outer London Councils to try and thwart the Mayor's plans. The Secretary of State for Transport could also intervene if he had a mind to do so.

There is also a Parliamentary petition requesting the position of Mayor of London be removed – see <https://tinyurl.com/yx6s4963> . I suggest you sign it!

Roger Lawson

Report to the Mayor on ULEZ Expansion:
<https://tinyurl.com/5burc9kz>




London Mayor's Transport Strategy Failing

Transport for London (TfL) have published their latest report on Travel in London. It shows that Sadiq Khan's Transport Strategy is a complete failure.

The Mayor has a target of 80% of journeys to be via active travel modes (which even includes bus journeys). But in fact the number or trips by walking and cycling was only 31% in Q3 2022. That is only slightly higher than the 27% in the pre-pandemic 2019 year.

People are still avoiding public transport because covid is still prevalent and more people have changed travel patterns to work partly from home or have flexible

Figure 7 Estimated quarterly trips and mode shares by mode, 2019-2022.



Source: TfL City Planning.

working hours which probably accounts for the small increase in walking/cycling. But it is clear that the overall use of active travel modes has not changed much in the last two years and any changes have been influenced more by the covid epidemic and higher taxes on private cars and higher public transport fares.

You can see the actual London mode share trends in the chart above.

The targets for active travel physical activity are not being met. The report says "results suggest that the proportion of Londoners achieving the target decreased during the pandemic".



These numbers did not stop some media reports claiming that cycling had increased by 40%. This is a complete lie based on using selective data. Cycling still only accounts for about 3% of all trips and is heavily influenced by weather conditions. The UK went through a very dry period this year but the last two months have been the exact opposite and is not in the above data.

Public transport use remains low and significantly below the pre-pandemic level which is a major problem for TfL's finances as they rely on fare income, particularly from buses. The Mayor is going to reduce the bus network to save money but has now taken a U-Turn on that idea which he will surely live to regret. TfL are forecasting a greater shift to on-line shopping with people making fewer and more local

shopping trips. They also foresee an increase in LGV trips associated with home deliveries except in central London and a drop in HGV trips due to reduced construction, general haulage and retail activity. The trend to have few private car trips in London will continue, replaced by the use of taxis, PHVs and internet shopping delivery vehicles.

Vision Zero

The TfL report also gives some data on road casualties. Here again the Mayor's "Vision Zero" policy is not working. The figures are distorted by the reductions in vehicle traffic during the pandemic but the report says: "2021 was an unusual year with large changes in the composition of people regrettably killed or seriously injured. This was largely due to new travel patterns in the wake of the pandemic.

Motorcycling and pedestrian fatalities were significantly lower by historic standards but cycling fatalities and serious injuries increased".

The Mayor's promotion of cycling has actually resulted in relatively small increases in cycling but large increases in KSIs involving cyclists. Cycling is intrinsically more dangerous than other transport modes but cyclists won't listen. The Mayor is unlikely to reach the targets for KSIs in 2022.

The increase in cycling speeds promoted by cycling fanatics and supported by cycle superhighways together with increases in electric bikes and e-scooters are proving to be negative influences.

Continued on next page.



Mayor's Transport Strategy (Cont.)

Summary

A very disappointing report showing the negative trends on mobility in London. Will the Mayor change his stance? We doubt it because his Transport Strategy was always based on dogma rather than rational analysis.

TfL report here:
<https://tinyurl.com/nhbjtm6x>

Our campaign against the Mayor's Transport Strategy:
<https://tinyurl.com/2y87v6tr>

Transport Disruptions

The Reagan move had a significant impact on union activities in other organisations effectively resetting labour relationships in the USA. Strikes fell in subsequent years. From 370 major strikes in 1970 the number fell to 11 in 2010, and it had a positive effect in reducing inflation.

Just as Margaret Thatcher handled the coal miners in the UK, Reagan's firm resolve on facing up to the unions created a new and better culture.

As regards the Just Stop Oil (JSO) campaign the closure of the Dartford Bridge created enormous traffic jams and delayed people for many hours. The whole of south-east London was affected as many people commute around the M25. The Metropolitan Police tweeted they had "made 404 arrests linked to

and How to Stop Them

In the South-East of England we are suffering from major transport disruptions. First from rail strikes affecting London commuters and second by the activities of Just Stop Oil on the road network.

The RMT union have announced further strikes and balloted their members on pursuing them for another six months. Your editor issued a tweet which suggested the way to stop these strikes was to give an ultimatum to employees to either work normally or get fired. The problem is that train drivers are so highly paid that a few days out is affordable.

Rather surprisingly I got a response from the RMT which said "In your haste to sound draconian you've not considered who would staff the railway or train the replacements if you've fired them all? Nothing would move for years!!".

JSO activity. We have needed nearly 5500 officer shifts diverted from local communities in London, to deal with the serious disruption caused by this activity". The total cost including the delays to people must be many millions of pounds.

The Police seem to be totally ineffective in stopping the activities of JSO. People get arrested but then released. Fines, if any, are minimal. There is a Bill currently going through Parliament that might assist – The Public Order Bill. It creates a number of new offences relating to "locking-on", obstructing major transport works and interfering with the use or operation of key national infrastructure. It also confers preventative powers for the police to search for and seize articles related to protest-related offences and provides for a new

My response was "Well it worked when Ronald Reagan did it for air traffic controllers, did it not?".

This refers to the events in August 1981 in the USA. To quote from Wikipedia: "After PATCO workers' refusal to return to work [over a pay dispute], the Reagan administration fired the 11,345 striking air traffic controllers who had ignored the order, and banned them from federal service for life. In the wake of the strike and mass firings, the FAA was faced with the difficult task of hiring and training enough controllers to replace those that had been fired. Under normal conditions, it took three years to train new controllers. Until replacements could be trained, the vacant positions were temporarily filled with a mix of non-participating controllers, supervisors, staff personnel, some non-rated personnel, military controllers, and controllers transferred temporarily from other facilities". The US airlines continued operations with minimal disruptions.



Follow the Blog

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

<https://freedomfordrivers.blog/>

To get the latest news as it appears, follow the blog.

preventative court order, the Serious Disruption Prevention Order, to disrupt the activities of repeat offenders". But will it be applied vigorously?

The Police already have considerable powers that are not used and JSO could be proscribed as a "terrorist organisation" as they meet the criteria. Let us hope the Public Order Bill is passed quickly. But it's really down to the Government to take a lead on this matter.

FFDF Web Site Redeveloped – A Big Improvement!

The Freedom for Drivers Foundation web site (www.freedomfordrivers.org) has been redeveloped using Wix (see screen shot to the right).

The content has not been revised but the layout has been improved and it now supports mobile devices much better. After 15 years this is a major improvement and will form a better basis for future marketing activities. It has been carefully checked out but if you notice any problems with the new site or have suggestions for improvements please let us know by using the Contact tab on the new web site. We will continue to oppose the unreasonable restrictions placed on law-abiding drivers and excessive taxation.




The new web site is of course supported by news coverage on our blog, and our social media (primarily on Twitter and Facebook).

The web site development did cost us some money so please make a donation to support this and our other activities – go here: <https://tinyurl.com/2p848sw> .

We need to continue to inform people about the duplicitous activities of politicians on transport issues.

Roger Lawson



Judicial Reviews and How to Pursue Them

A Judicial Review is a legal process that enables you to challenge decisions by central or local Government bodies or where the law may have been applied incorrectly by tribunals or other courts.

It has been widely used of late by environmental lobbyists to challenge planning decisions but it can also be helpful on motoring issues. For example applications for judicial reviews have been made over LTN schemes claiming they are in breach of the Equality Act or breach other legislation. There can also be challenges over the failure to consult fairly when consultation is legally required on proposals before implementation.

Continued on next page.



Judicial Reviews (Cont.)

See this blog post written last year for some examples and possible legal grounds over LTNs:
<https://tinyurl.com/4cct7cxh>

But they are not always easy cases to pursue because they are not judged on moral principles but simply on the legal technicalities. Cases can be thrown out before they are even heard by judges if they are not handled correctly and do not meet certain criteria. For example cases need to be raised as soon as possible after the issue comes to the attention of litigants or at least within 3 months.

A recent publication by the Courts and Judicial Tribunal entitled “Administrative Court Judicial Review Guide” is exceedingly helpful in explaining

what is required and the process that must be followed – see link below. It even explains how “litigants in person” are supported if you do not wish to pay for professional legal representation yourself. And it covers the issue of costs which must be taken into account which litigants may need to pay (and the defendants costs if you lose the case).

Costs can vary wildly. For example this writer has been involved in two judicial reviews. The first was a challenge to the suspension of a hearing in a magistrate’s court on an alleged motoring offence when a key prosecution witness failed to turn up. This cost me less than £2,000 in court fees and my own solicitor’s fees. The case was referred back to the magistrate’s court when the witness again failed to appear so the case was abandoned.

The other was the challenge to the Government’s nationalisation of Northern Rock where legal costs of both sides were several

million pounds. The court refused to overturn the decision in parliament by Labour MPs to force nil compensation to shareholders.

One can apply for a “cost cap” to stop the defendants running up enormous bills which Government bodies and Councils can otherwise easily do. And note that if a claim is over an environmental issue then the Aarhus Convention can be invoked to limit costs further. See the Guide in Section 25 for more details.

Although it is possible to pursue a judicial review without legal representation I would recommend that people contemplating a judicial review do take some advice from solicitors familiar with the process. It is particularly worth noting this statement in the Guide: “In judicial review proceedings, the Court’s function is to determine whether the decision or conduct challenged was a lawful exercise of a public function, not to assess the merits of the



decision or conduct. It is therefore seldom necessary or appropriate to consider any evidence going beyond what was before the decision-maker and evidence about the process by which the decision was taken – let alone any expert evidence”.

In summary judicial reviews can be a useful tool for those challenging decisions of a public body but you need to adhere to the rules laid down by the courts including the timescales. The Guide is very helpful in that regard.

Administrative Court Judicial Review Guide 2022:
<https://tinyurl.com/2sfw4d7p>



the capacity of the roads and hence increase traffic congestion and air pollution. There is no information provided on any modelling of traffic flows that might have been done.

The changes include the right turn lane on Kingsway north-bound being changed into a right turn only into Remnant Street which is surely a bit odd.

Holborn Gyration Redesign

The Holborn gyration in London has been the scene of some fatal accidents to cyclists so the Borough of Camden is proposing some changes to improve safety. The changes proposed are somewhat trivial in nature although they are likely to reduce

These changes might benefit cyclists but they prejudice all other road users. More substantive changes are surely required to really solve the road safety problems in this area.

Go here for more details :
<https://tinyurl.com/4zj67juw>

Bromley Traffic and Road Safety Policies

The London Borough of Bromley have published a document summarising the Councils Traffic and Road Safety Policies written by Angus Culverwell, Director of Traffic and Parking. I have picked this out for review because it is a good example for other councils to follow. In essence a rational and logical policy within the financial resources available.

You can read the complete policy in Agenda Item 13e of a council meeting (see link below), but I highlight a few points here:

The cost of various road engineering measures is given as follows (which those proposing such measures should bear in mind):

- Example costs to install traffic engineering measures are set out here:
- a) Zebra crossing - £25k to £50k, depending on location, necessity for anti-skid road surface, kerb realignments, presence of statutory services etc.
 - b) Signal controlled crossing - approximately £75k to £100k, depending on location.
 - c) Mini roundabout - £10k to £100k, depending upon location, need for deflection, existing road surface etc.
 - d) Full size roundabout - £120k+ according to size and location.
 - e) Speed table - £20k to £100k, depending on junction, need to raise or change footways etc.
 - f) Speed hump - £4k.
 - g) Traffic island or pedestrian refuge - £7k to £15k, depending on size.
 - h) Bike lane - these can vary hugely in cost depending on if they are set out simply with signs and road markings or are segregated from traffic, requiring changes to the infrastructure and possible relocation of utilities.

- i) Flashing warning sign - £3k to £10k depending upon size, vehicle-activated or timed etc.
- j) Road marking - £50 for a small one.

The presence of utility providers equipment, usually under the footway or carriageway, can greatly affect the cost of a scheme and may render it unviable. For example, relocating one telecommunications chamber can easily cost over £100k.

It's worth pointing out that even if TfL are financing a review of the war memorial traffic lights in Chislehurst to see if pedestrian safety improvements can be made, you can see that any change to such a complex junction could be very expensive.

Other parts of the report worth quoting are:

Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTN) and School Streets



Due to operational restraints, no school street will be installed in the borough unless the school is prepared to organise and operate them through the use of temporary, manned barriers. The Council will not approve LTNs with local roads blocked off and traffic diverted onto other roads. None of these schemes will be enforced using cameras.

Speeding

As a general rule, the Council will not install any new 20mph limit or zones. This is because the reduction in speed limit through signs and road markings alone does not seem to have much effect on drivers' speeds. Since the Council is unable to enforce these speed limits, it is an ineffective use of limited resources. The Council will install part-time 20mph limits at the beginning and end of the

school day with flashing lights outside schools, decided on merit. In exceptional cases, full-time 20mph limits may be appropriate in certain locations such as High Streets.

Speed Humps

In the past, we have introduced road humps and tables to reduce traffic speeds and improve safety. However, the police, fire brigade, ambulance service and London Transport have objected to the proliferation of road humps and raised tables because of the increase in attendance times for emergency calls and discomfort and possible injury to their passengers.

Road humps and raised tables can also lead to complaints from residents about increased noise and vibration from traffic. For these reasons the council has

decided not to introduce any further road humps in the borough and to only use tables as a last resort at a junction with an ongoing collision problem.

There is a range of alternative measures to encourage lower vehicle speeds, such as our vehicle activated warning signs, roadside posters, safer speed campaigns/events and driver/rider training programmes, such as the young driver traffic education scheme and Driven by Consequences.

Footway Parking

There is a London-wide ban on parking vehicles on the footway and verges. This is covered by Section 15 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 which came into effect in 1985.

Continued on next page.



Bromley Policies (Cont.)

However, the Council will consider exempting a road and allowing partial or full footway parking if an absolute minimum of 1m can be maintained on the footway for wheelchair and push chair users (in line with Disability Discrimination Act 1995 guidelines), if the footway is suitable for vehicle over-run and if there is a specific reason to allow footway parking. Parking on grass verges is prohibited.

In summary this is a well thought out policy not dictated by dogma or prejudice against vehicle users as in some other London Councils.

Environment and Community Services Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee:
<https://tinyurl.com/ye2aadwd>

Roger Lawson



Profiting from Parking

The London Borough of Bromley have published proposals to raise parking charges and scrap all “pay and display” parking machines. It was discussed at a Committee Meeting on the 22nd November. These are some of the key points:

Significant rises in both off and on street parking charges are proposed. For example for on-street parking charges might rise from 60p per hour to 80p per hour, a 33% increase. Charges do vary between locations and can be considerably more than that. The increase is to offset the reduction in the usage of parking no doubt because of the

pandemic and increase in internet shopping. Parking charges were last reviewed four years ago so some increase may be justified to cope with inflation.

The increase in permit parking charges is very substantial – up from £50 to £80 for a resident’s permit – a 60% increase

Note that on-street parking and permit charges should not be used as a revenue raising measure as firmly established in legal precedents which the Council seems to be ignoring. These increases will result in substantial and unjustified surplus income over administration and enforcement costs. This paragraph from the report makes the motive clear: “In summary the various changes on this paper can potentially bring about savings/income of approx. £967k by 2024/25 to the Council which currently has significant budget pressures and a budget gap to fund in 2023/24 onwards”.



It is also proposed to remove all pay and display machines. The only way to pay for parking will be using the RingGo service via a smartphone. The justification for this is that the cash machines are subject to vandalism and also use a 3G sim card which will cease working in 2023 and replacement is costly. Also the machines are unreliable and reaching the end of their useful lives so need replacing which would be very expensive.

A number of other London councils already have “digital only” parking and 90% of people have a smartphone. You can see therefore there is some justification for this change but it will also raise parking costs. The minimum fee for one hour parking via RingGo is £1 while a cash payment is 60p – a 66% higher fee at present.

I suggest some pay and display machines be retained and replaced by new models. Most of them have already been removed much to the inconvenience of residents.

In summary the Council should not be trying to fill its budget shortfall by raising parking charges and making payment less convenient.

If car park usage is falling then raising charges will reduce usage even more so that is not a sensible answer to the problem of reduced income.

The Council is even proposing to introduce charges for the Sundridge Park car park which is currently free. The last time this was done the commuters who parked there promptly moved to the surrounding roads to the

great annoyance of local residents and resulting in a financially unviable car park. Council employees seem to have short memories.

You can read the complete policy in Agenda Item 13h of the meeting (see link below). Parking provision should be a service for residents, not be used as a cash cow. This is unfortunately a spreading problem in all London Councils which should be condemned.

Environment and Community Services Policy Development and Scrutiny Committee:
<https://tinyurl.com/ye2aadwd>

Roger Lawson





CPZs

New Chislehurst CPZ

Bromley Council is pushing ahead with a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in central Chislehurst. According to a letter they have distributed from a survey they did of residents 77% supported the introduction of a CPZ and they now plan to extend the area covered to even more roads.

As we have repeatedly said in the past, CPZs do not solve parking problems, particularly when it is resident's own cars

that are filling up the roads (as in the picture above of Albany Road). See this page of our web site for more information on CPZs:

<https://tinyurl.com/42kchthz>

Of course as always the Council has a financial interest in promoting CPZs. Residents will be paying £100 per annum initially but no doubt more in future as once in place the charges always go up over time.

Bromley residents can see the wide area to be covered and respond to the public consultation here:

<https://tinyurl.com/4uxj7sdp>

Lewisham CPZs

The Borough of Lewisham is planning to extend CPZs across the whole of the borough.

It says extending CPZs borough-wide "would be a key tool as part of the council's approach to tackling the climate emergency

and reducing the impact of the car on the environment and health".

If CPZs were introduced into half of the poternisl streets, the council estimates an annual net income of £4 million. Clearly yet again an illegal policy!

Residents of boroughs affected by CPZs where there is a clear financial motive for installing them should use a judicial review to challenge them.

Letters to the Editor

Copies of letters sent to Traffic And Engineering Dept. Wandsworth Council (Letters edited for brevity):

Subject: Speed limit:

I do not live in the Borough of Wandsworth but drive through it regularly. I frequently drive through the Boroughs of Lambeth,



Lewisham and Southwark. Since the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in those boroughs there has been a dramatic increase in congestion which in turn causes an increase in pollution.

My journey times on many roads have increased due to drivers observing the reduced limit. I was a Police Officer for many years and as a senior Officer investigated a number of serious and fatal accidents. In every case the vehicles involved were travelling in excess of the then general 30mph. The argument regarding serious accidents involving vehicles travelling between 20 and 30 miles an hour is flawed and I would go so far as to say it is dishonest. I live in the borough of Bromley where reduced speed limits are imposed only where there is a

safety aspect, not on roads where traffic continues to travel freely. This seems to be a sensible application of the reduced limit.

Ian MacFarlane
Metropolitan Police (RTD)

As someone who needs to travel through Wandsworth quite regularly, I wish to formally register my objection to this proposal. My reasons are: -

1. The benefits of 20mph speed limits remain unclear. Whilst the injury risk to vulnerable road users is reduced between an impact at 30mph compared to 20mph, in reality the evidence suggests collisions within 30mph speed limits generally occur at much lower speeds. Therefore, there is no need to be prescriptive and impose a 20mph limit.

2. Most recent forensic analysis undertaken by universities and other expert bodies have found that the introduction of 20mph speed limits have had very little, if any, impact on road casualties.

3. For vehicles with internal combustion travelling at 20mph compared with 30 mph use more fuel per mile. This is because the engine is operating sub-optimally. At a time when the UK Government is moving to net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, it seems absurd that Wandsworth Council is moving in entirely the opposite direction with this proposal.

4. From my perspective there appears to have been little public consultation on this proposal and certainly no environmental impact assessment. Robert Constant, C. Eng, MIMechE



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: <http://www.freedomfordrivers.org/register.htm> and fill out the form to be added to our mailing list.

Address Changes

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

About the Freedom for Drivers Foundation (FFDF)

The Freedom for Drivers Foundation (FFDF) is an 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 road tolls. We also campaign for more enlightened road safety policies. More information on the FFDF is available from our web site at www.freedomfordrivers.org

Contact and Publisher Information

This Newsletter is published by the Freedom for Drivers Foundation, PO Box 62, Chislehurst, Kent, BR7 5YB and is distributed free of charge to registered supporters and to anyone else who has an interest in traffic and transport issues. All material contained herein is Copyright of the FFDF 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 FFDF.

The FFDF also publishes a blog which can be found here: <https://freedomfordrivers.blog/> or you can follow us on Twitter here: https://twitter.com/Drivers_London

FFDF Director and Newsletter Editor: Roger Lawson (Tel: 020-8295-0378). Use the web site Contact Page here to contact: www.freedomfordrivers.org/Contact.htm . The FFDF would be happy to advise or assist anyone who is concerned about any traffic, transport or road safety issues in London or elsewhere in the UK. 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 . This newsletter is supplied in electronic form which can be displayed and printed via the free Adobe Acrobat Reader. Past copies of our newsletters can be obtained from the www.freedomfordrivers.org web site or by contacting the publisher.

