



BBRAG NEWS

Bromley Borough Roads Action Group - No. 49 (November 2007)

In This Issue

- *Lycra Louts and Cycle Stop Lines*
- *Road Deaths in London Rise*
- *Third World Country Subsidises London Bus Fares*
- *Mobile Speed Cameras in Bromley*
- *Living Under Livingstone*
- *Intelligent Speed Adaptation*
- *Overwhelming Opposition to Greenwich Road Tolls*
- *20 Mph Speed Limits*
- *More Anti-Car Plans*
- *Capita and the Congestion Charge*
- *Bromley Town Centre Plans*
- *How to Collect Cash from the Public*
- *News Snapshots*
- *B.B.R.A.G. Information and Contacts*

Editorial

Unlike the last edition, which was early and larger than normal, this one is late and smaller. Unfortunately I have had my time diverted by the problems of Northern Rock and its shareholders. So apologies if I have failed to cover some newsworthy items.

As this will be the last edition before Xmas, I wish our readers all the best for the New Year.

Roger Lawson, Editor

Lycra Louts and Cycle Stop Lines



Following calls to introduce camera enforcement of cycle advanced stop lines, which would result in potentially enormous numbers of extra fines on motorists, it is worth reading a report recently published by TRL. This is report PPR240 commissioned for Transport for London on the behaviour of cyclists and motorists at junctions where there is a reserved space for cyclists.

The report shows that although there appeared to be some encroachment by motorists in 36% of events studied by the authors of the report, there were no obvious safety problems as a result (the photograph above shows a typical "encroachment" as covered by the report). In fact the report says that most such encroachments were only partial and "*this indicates a degree of restraint in encroaching upon the cyclist's space*". It also reports that the presence of such "advance safety lines" (ASLs) resulted in much lower infringement of the pedestrian crossing area at junctions.

The new regulations are proposed in a Bill called the "London Local Authorities and Transport for London Bill 2007" that is being put before Parliament soon. The ABD's submission on this Bill to TfL is present on the internet at: www.freedomfordrivers.org/ASL_Consultation.pdf

(Editor's Comments: It would seem to me that motorists have to cope with a very complex problem in this area.. They are permitted to cross into the ASL when traffic lights are green, but as soon as they change to red they must stop, or risk breaking the law by crossing the red light. They therefore logically have to halt sometimes partially in the ASL area. Such accidental infringement of the ASL should not be penalised and in fact is not an offence so far as I understand the law so there could be numerous false penalty notices or ones that will fail for lack of suitable evidence. The fact that such a complex law, which few people understand, is likely to be enforced in future just shows how many modern motoring laws are unjust and inequitable)

Lycra Louts Regularly Break the Law



The most interesting aspect of this report is however is the fact that it shows how frequently cyclists cross traffic lights set at red (examples above and below were photographed near Tower Hill and numerous examples were seen in just a few minutes). In fact 17% of cyclists studied crossed on a red light at the ASL sites covered by this report. And this was 4% higher than at other traffic lights without ASLs which suggests that ASLs actually encourage such behaviour.



Rather than introducing more ASLs in the name of providing safer conditions for cyclists, perhaps their use should be re-examined or modifications considered to reduce these incidents?

(Editor: Note that 80% of the cyclists who broke the law and took part in this dangerous kind of behaviour were male, and one only has to stand at some of the junctions mentioned to see what kind of cyclists these are – hence the reference to “lycra louts” to describe a certain style of rider. The fact that almost no enforcement action is taken against this persistent law breaking, which is a clear road safety hazard, while motorists may be fined for technical breaches of inept laws that are impossible to comply with and where there is no obvious road safety issue, amply demonstrates how perverse justice has become in the motoring arena.)

Pedestrian Killed by Cyclist

After the above article was written, city fund manager Nick Bancroft was knocked down and killed by a cyclist while on his way to work. The accident happened near his home in Holland Park when Mr Bancroft was crossing the road at a junction. He suffered head injuries and died three days later. A similar incident was also reported in the West Country.


Road Deaths in London Rise



The London Road Safety Unit (part of TfL) has recently published the road accident figures for 2006 (see www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/2840.aspx for the full report). Fatal accidents rose by 8% over the previous year to 231, and serious injuries also rose by 8% to 3,715. These figures were unexpected of course and TfL suggest there is some error in “data processing” but have been unable to identify exactly what.

Although slight injuries fell by 8%, those figures are more suspect due to possible variations in reporting. The KSI data is particularly disappointing bearing in mind that resources tend to concentrated on reducing the killed and seriously injured numbers.

The result is that the target for a reduction of fatalities of 50% by 2010 looks unlikely to be met as you can see from the chart taken from the TfL report following:



The truly amazing thing that this graph shows is that in essence fatalities in London have barely changed since 1994 despite the enormous growth in expenditure on road safety – particularly on speed humps, speed cameras, 20 mph zones, speed limit reductions, and lots of other similar “gestures”. Meanwhile traffic volumes in London have not changed much in those years.

KSI figures show a more positive trend over the same period, but even there the latest data shows a major rise since the low point seen in early 2005.

Taking the overall casualty figures, pedal cyclists were the only group though that showed an increase, probably simply because cycling is more common. Accidents involving powered two-wheelers, which have been a growing problem in recent years, seem at least to have stabilised.

(Editor: it appears to me that these figures demonstrate that road safety policies need to be substantially rethought. The same problems are of course reflected on a national basis where fatalities are also not falling significantly. Clearly the current policies are not working but all we get from Government ministers and road safety advocates tends to be “more of the same will solve the problem”. There is currently an enormous amount of your taxpayers’ money being wasted on ineffective solutions to reducing road deaths.)

Third World Country Subsidises London Bus Fares



Mayor Ken Livingstone has shown his willingness to partner with all kinds of people to bring lower bus fares to Londoners by doing a deal with Hugo Chavez of Venezuela. The President of Venezuela has established himself as one of the leaders of the left-wing movement but is seen by many as a dangerous populist. To quote from Wikipedia, *“his opponents see him as an authoritarian or a totalitarian communist, militarist and demagogue who has failed to deliver on his promises, violated fundamental rights, meddled in the affairs of other Latin American countries, threatened Venezuela’s economy and democracy, illegally silenced opponents, and destabilized global oil prices.”*

The deal involves Petroleos de Venezuela, the state owned oil company, in providing up to \$32million to provide cheap oil and the saving will be spent on subsidies to the bus fares of London residents who receive income support. Single parents, carers, the long-term sick and disabled people will benefit from the plan.

In return, Transport for London will set up an office in Caracas, Venezuela to advise them on public transport improvements and traffic management where congestion is chronic.

Tackled on his association with Mr Chavez by reporters, Ken Livingstone said *“Frankly I would rather be getting into bed with him than, as the British Government has been, getting into bed with George W. Bush”*. Soon after Boris Johnson said *“I say it’s completely Caracas”*.

(Editor’s Comments: As usual Mr Livingstone is displaying his abilities to offend people without much prompting. To give you some idea of the conditions in Caracas, the only visit I have ever planned to Venezuela some years ago had to be cancelled at the last minute after as many as 1000 people were killed in riots prompted by a rise in the cost of bus fares in the capital. Perhaps TfL may learn something from their visit too).

Mobile Speed Cameras in Bromley

According to the latest newsletter from the Chislehurst "Safer Neighbourhoods" police team, Bromley Police have purchased a Pro Laser hand-held speed gun for use by the Safer Neighbourhood Teams. They also asked for suggestions as to where it should be deployed, so your editor sent them the following email:

I notice in your latest newsletter that you are asking for suggestions as to where the new Pro Laser speed gun should be used. Well my suggestion would be "nowhere".

Alternatively you could use it outside the homes of those people who support the use of these devices, so they would be shown to be the hypocrites that they are.

Apart from the fact that there are no obvious speeding problems in Chislehurst, except on those roads like Perry Street where the speed limit has been set artificially low based on political dogma rather than sound road safety and traffic engineering policy, all laser speed cameras are known to be prone to error and should not be used in law enforcement. The errors in speed recording to which these devices are prone have been demonstrated on several TV programmes, including another one only last week.

Of course you may be ignorant of these problems in which case I would be glad to provide further information.

Roger Lawson

Note the email address of this organisation is: chislehurst.snt@met.police.uk in case you want to tell them something similar. One oddity about this is that Safer Neighbourhood Teams are mostly manned by PCSOs (ie. Police Community Support Officers, not full police officers). I am not aware that legally PCSOs would be capable of presenting any evidence in a court of law on speeding offences.

Living Under Livingstone



We published a lengthy article on the failures of the London Congestion Charge system in our last edition. If you want a more extended critical review of the Mayor's track record then one of the most informative publications is a note from the Conservative Bow Group entitled "London Under Livingstone" (see www.bowgroup.org).

It points out how expensive the Mayor's management of transport in London has become, with rampant inflation of costs and resulting large increases in taxes on Londoners. Although bus and tube journeys have increased, the former now has operating losses of over £600 million per annum, which means that every London household subsidises it at the rate of £212 per year.

Meanwhile TfL bureaucracy rockets upwards – they now employ 232 people who are paid more than £100,000 per year (by comparison the Home Office gets by with 43, and the Treasury has just 7). There are now an incredible 173 press and communication staff employed by TfL and the Greater London Authority, who spend a lot of their time trying to persuade us that the Mayor has been doing a great job for London.

In some ways the report is over generous in that it suggests that all the management mistakes that have been made are directly down to the policies and decisions of Mr Livingstone. In reality the failure is the result of TfL and the GLA becoming dominated by political fantasy and by people (appointed directly or indirectly by the Mayor) who are more interested in posturing than making sound operational and financial decisions.

But anyone who is considering voting for Mr Livingstone when he comes up for re-election next May should read the Bow Group's document. They might then decide to vote for "anyone but Ken" which is the popular slogan being promoted by some.

Livingstone's Recent Comments

Mayor Livingstone spoke at the recent Labour Party conference. He said that London was ready to go first in the introduction of road pricing and he had discussions with Transport Secretary Douglas Alexander on this matter. *"We would be delighted to get that shift away from the car" and "It's ever more urgent that we do everything we can to bring our carbon emissions down"* he said. But almost contemporaneously he said in remarks to the London Assembly, during questioning on his support of the Thames Gateway bridge, that *"By the time the bridge is built we'll have moved a lot closer to less polluting cars. When this bridge is no more than a decade old we might very well find we don't have pollution from cars in the way we've been used to in the past"*.

(Editor: Well it may be possible to reconcile the above two statements, but it looks more like a case of muddle-headed policies to cope with inconsistent objectives. Mayor Livingstone wants the Thames Gateway Bridge for economic reasons, but finds it difficult to reconcile this with his apparent basic hatred of motor vehicles. And of course it's difficult to expand the population of London and its economy without generating more emissions).

Cab Drivers In Court

The London Cab Drivers Club who represent black cab drivers have taken the Mayor to court for a judicial review over the imposition of emissions equipment which costs them £1,900. They say it simply does not work. Mr Livingstone in his usually politic manner said *"The Cab Drivers Club is a small reactionary clique who have opposed everything I have done as Mayor for six years. If they want to chance their arm they should start suing me for libel because I am saying they falsified the tests"*.

(Editor: If Livingstone continues to offend people in this kind of way, he may soon have few supporters left when it comes to the elections next May.)

Boris Johnson for Mayor?

Boris Johnson was selected as the Conservative candidate for Mayor recently, by a large majority of voters in the "Primary". He soon after announced his opposition to any Congestion Charge in Greenwich.

Intelligent Speed Adaptation

Intelligent Speed Adaptation (ISA) is one of those modern euphemisms that actually describe the exact opposite – namely dumb speed control that overrides human intelligence and stops anyone exceeding the posted speed limit irrespective of the road conditions or circumstances. If Transport for London (TfL) and the Mayor have their way, it's coming to London soon. TfL have recently issued a tender notice for a contract to supply such a system, which reads as follows:

SHORT DESCRIPTION OF NATURE AND QUANTITY OR VALUE OF SUPPLIES OR SERVICES: The object of this contract is to procure an Intelligent Speed Adaptation (ISA) solution for London. The authority will provide a digital speed limit map of London and the system will utilise this asset. The system will consist of a GPS receiver with map-matching and dead reckoning capability, hardware for storing the digital speed map, ability to process updates to the map via an ad-hoc wireless network and an engine management system providing vehicle throttle control (e.g. haptic throttle). It is important that the system works across a wide range of vehicles such as cars, vans, buses and taxis. Levels of system intervention will be vary from 'advisory' (warning alarm signal) through 'voluntary' (the acceleration of the vehicle is restricted) as described below. The unit will be controllable via a dashboard control or, preferably a steering wheel control with the unit being able to set to: Off (unit is completely disabled); Advisory ISA (unit provides audio warning of exceeding the speed limit); Voluntary disabled ISA: Unit is set to disabled but will automatically re-engage when the vehicle passes into a new speed limit or slows below the speed limit. Once engaged acceleration beyond the speed limit will be prevented; Voluntary on ISA: Unit prevents acceleration beyond the speed limit. Transport for London (TfL) is potentially looking for a longer term partner which, if the initial trial on TfL vehicles proves successful, would be interested in working with TfL to promote the technology throughout London.

Overwhelming Opposition to Greenwich Road Tolls

The Association of British Drivers has been trying for some time to obtain the results of several surveys undertaken for Transport for London (TfL) on possible congestion charging schemes for the London Borough of Greenwich. These were completed as long ago as 2006 and requests to see the resulting reports were submitted under the Freedom of Information Act some months ago. After repeated and unjustifiable delays, the ABD has finally received them. What do they show? Simply that TfL had good reason to delay publication because the results are deeply embarrassing to their proposed plans.

To remind you, TfL were supposed to announce their plans for "traffic demand management" (i.e. a congestion charge or road tolls) in Greenwich in the summer of 2007. Now some politicians are denying there are any such plans, despite the fact that one of the reports we have obtained is actually entitled "Greenwich Feasibility Study" and shows exactly what was being considered.

More than one study has been performed and here's a summary of the findings:

IPSOS/MORI Report: 61% are Opposed

A report based on telephone surveys in November 2006 of people who have traveled through Greenwich town centre in the last six months showed that 61% opposed the introduction of congestion charging in Greenwich, versus 29% who would support it. In fact the opposition rose to 68% when only those who reside in Greenwich were counted.

Accent Report: 77% are Opposed

Another report, again based on telephone surveys and published in October 2007 shows 77% are opposed to the principle of a congestion charge scheme in Greenwich, with only 16% supporting it.

When asked to approve or disapprove such a scheme (presumably based on the proposals described to them), the figures became even more pronounced with 80% disapproving and only 9% approving.

Concern about Congestion

Note though that there is clear concern about the level of traffic congestion in Greenwich. For example from the latter survey, 64% thought that traffic congestion was a problem, and 15% of respondents (27% of residents) thought it "very important" to reduce congestion. But clearly they don't want a road toll scheme!

Increasing Opposition to Central London scheme

There was a majority who supported "congestion charging in other parts of London" in the first survey – possibly a comment on the central London scheme, or plain "nimbyism" as the report points out. However, in the latter survey, it is clear that 48% oppose the central London scheme versus 33% who support it. This of course contradicts other survey reports by TfL about the popularity of the central London scheme among London residents.

Subsequent News

Soon after the above information was released, the Mayor of London, Ken Livingstone, said the following in response to a question from a Member during his Mayor's Question Time session at the Greater London Assembly:

1. He was approached by Greenwich Council as congestion is very severe. Greenwich town centre is more congested than any other in London, with 50% of traffic being through traffic.
2. They have looked at all the options, both wide area and more local schemes.
3. Greenwich may pursue a small area scheme in a "discrete" zone.
4. There will not be tolling on the Blackwall Tunnel.
5. It is up to Greenwich Council if they pursue a scheme for a small discrete zone that does not impact on any other boroughs or the A2.

Note: this means that although a wide area scheme that covers the A2 and Blackwall Tunnel is probably no longer on the agenda, it does not mean that a more limited road toll or congestion charge is not still being contemplated. In addition of course, the Mayor may change his mind after the elections next May.

20 Mph Speed Limits



PACTS has called for a default 20 mph speed limit in urban areas. Jenny Jones, Green Party member and Road Safety Adviser to Ken Livingstone has also put forward a proposal that this should apply to the whole of

London, with a few minor exceptions.

To quote from a press release issued by Ms Jones: "The Mayor has agreed to lobby the Government for 20mph as the default speed limit in London, if a feasibility report says that it is a viable idea. He was responding to questions from Jenny Jones who said that the feasibility study was one of the initiatives the Mayor needed to take in order to gain her support for his budget next year."

The Mayor suggested that this limit could be enforced by cameras, as is currently being trialled, without the use of speed humps.

(Editor's Comments: Readers should be aware that Livingstone only managed to get his budget approved by the Assembly last year with the support of the Greens. Clearly they have the whip hand and are now trying to dictate the Mayor's policies in an outrageous way. The proposal to introduce such a speed limit across the whole of London, supported by cameras, would have three very undesirable consequences:

1. It would mean every street in London would have surveillance cameras in place – an outrageous intrusion into our privacy.

2. It would slow traffic down on roads where 30 mph is a much more reasonable speed than 20 mph. In fact there are very few roads in the outer boroughs where most drivers consider it necessary to drive that slowly – and drivers are the best judge of what is a safe speed.

3. The cost of introducing such cameras across the whole of London would be enormous, and who would pay for them? Undoubtedly the motorist!

In my view, this kind of proposal is sheer lunacy and shows the kind of anti-car hysteria that is now rampant in the Mayor's office. It's yet another attempt to make driving so difficult and expensive that use of a car becomes practically impossible in London. A concealed agenda that is pursued by car haters in the name of road safety).

Note that there are a lot of spurious claims about the benefits of 20 mph zones in London. They are claimed to reduce casualties by substantial amounts, but although they have been widely introduced in London in recent years, supported by speed humps, as you can see from the other article in this edition, road deaths have not fallen.

More Anti-Car Plans

Another initiative from the Green Party, taken up by the Mayor, is the plan to ban all traffic on roads connecting London's parks and main shopping areas, such as Portland Place which runs between Regents Park and Oxford Street.

He also proposes to pedestrianise the Victoria Embankment for the whole of August, which is one of the main routes running East to West through London.

Jenny Jones said: "Making it more enjoyable for people to go by foot will help to cut congestion....."

Needless to say objections were raised to these ideas by an enormous number of people, but the Mayor does not seem to be listening. The objectors simply said that diverting traffic in this way onto other more tortuous routes, and typically onto narrow roads would cause more congestion and make air pollution worse.

Capita and the Congestion Charge



Capita is to lose the London Congestion Charge contract, which will no doubt please those who have had to deal with their call centre operators and administrative staff. From

2009 it will be operated by IBM. The change was apparently made because they quoted a lower price.

(Editor's Comments: Interesting that this contract change was announced well before the end of the existing contract in 2009. Has the new contract been signed yet? Is this an attempt by Ken Livingstone to bind his successor after next May's election for many years before he goes?)

Bromley Town Centre Plans

Bromley Council have developed an "Area Action Plan" for the town centre, which is now open to public consultation. See www.bromley.gov.uk/environment/planning/town+centre+action+plan/ for details. BBRAG was involved in the consultations with "stakeholders" and most of the proposals are sensible.

However, although substantial new development is proposed with new retail stores, new housing, etc, it is proposed to "mitigate" the impact of the additional traffic that might be generated by using "soft measures" such as restricting parking provision.

It seems unlikely to us that development opportunities will look attractive to potential developers if they realise that customers, or occupiers, of such properties are going to be deterred from accessing them other than by public transport – such people may simply prefer to go elsewhere.

How to Collect Cash from the Public



Councillors: are your budgets tight? Do you need more cash? Here's a simple solution that is being implemented by Bromley Council.

Remember all those cameras that you put up in town high streets to deter crime and stop anti-social behaviour? Examples in the borough of Bromley are Orpington High Street, Beckenham High Street, Penge High Street and several roads in Bromley town centre. Well it's now possible to use these cameras for enforcement of parking regulations.

In addition, you could put a CCTV camera in a vehicle and have it patrol the streets looking for similar infringements.

So Bromley plans to raise an additional £134,000 per year from this source. Even after employing another two people on these tasks it will generate substantial additional income. Such enforcement is already in use in the borough in Market Square, so it means that unsuspecting drivers who stop for even a couple of minutes without realising they are committing an offence, may find a ticket in the post a few days later.

(Editor: The excuse given for the implementation of these schemes is the difficulty of enforcement. But this is nonsense.. If there was persistent and regular infringement then it would be easy to stop. No the motive is simply to raise more money to fill the yawning gaps in council budgets. Cameras should not be used to spy on the public and issue tickets days later. All such enforcement systems are wrong and should be stopped – and the same thing applies to bus lane cameras, box junction cameras, and all other "decriminalised" offences subject to fixed penalty notices. There is no justice when anyone is not challenged immediately where an infringement is alleged, and it should be done by someone in person, not by the issuing of a ticket by someone hiding miles away).

News Snapshots

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

+ The Conservatives have claimed that the granting of free bus passes to teenagers has caused crime to soar on Bromley's buses. Since the scheme started in September 2003, youth crimes have totalled 5,071 in the first year of operation, compared with 3,666 in the previous year. They allege this is the result of gangs of youths "commuting" to Bromley from other inner London boroughs.

+ Chislehurst Conservative Councillor Eric Bosshard has produced a report on traffic in the borough. It reports that Bromley experiences the lowest level of vehicular delays per mile of road than any London borough, but residents still have concerns about traffic congestion. It points out that Transport for London (TfL) effectively control Bromley Council's road budget. They have awarded total grants of £3.77 million in 2007/8 but only £1.44 million of that can be spent on infrastructure including road maintenance. The rest is for things like bus lanes, walking and cycling programmes, 20 mph zones, etc. The full note can be obtained from office@bromleyconservatives.co.uk.

+ Transport for London (TfL) is apparently considering closing some motorway junctions in or near London so as to relieve congestion. Brian Coleman, a GLA Member known for his strong views on traffic issues, claims that a TfL officer revealed that they were considering closing junction 2 on the M1 where it joins the North Circular "possibly at peak times and possibly permanently". Coleman's reaction was "what is this madness". Apparently junction closure proposals were also being considered for the M3 and M4. TfL have denied they have any plans in place to do this but admit they are studying how to improve traffic management in these areas. *(Editor's Comments: this sounds like the typical TfL response to traffic congestion problems – we'll solve it by stopping anyone going anywhere).*

+ The Association of British Drivers in the London region have launched a new web site at www.freedomfordrivers.org. It covers the activities of the association in the London area.

+ The decision of the City of Albuquerque to remove speed humps from some of their roads was covered in our last newsletter. A video of the council meeting that made this decision can be viewed at:

[http://www.debunkingportland.com/Video/Albuquerque-01\(256K\).wmv](http://www.debunkingportland.com/Video/Albuquerque-01(256K).wmv).

+ The Crossrail project looks like it is going to go ahead with additional funding being promised by the City of London Corporation. It will take at least ten years to build at a cost of £16bn, and the Mayor assures us that it will be on time and within budget and Londoners will not bear the burden if it overruns. *(Editor's comment: this enormously expensive project did not seem justified to me on a cost/benefit basis when I covered it in a previous newsletter, and will starve other transport projects of funds – that's probably why it's taken successive governments over 20 years to make their mind up to do it).*

+ Bromley council will incur extra annual costs of £81,000 because of the proposed Low Emission Zone (LEZ) in London. These costs will arise because the vehicles used for road gritting, which only typically operate for 45 days of the year, are non-compliant. Because of their light usage such vehicles typically last for many years and hence do not comply with modern emission standards. The cost to upgrade them would be £783,000 in 2007/8 and £948,000 in the period up to 2011/12. And the council believes that it would "almost certainly be impossible to guarantee the timely acquisition of compliant vehicles, even if the council could afford this".

+ The Department of Transport have recently published a document entitled "Local Transport Note 1/07 Traffic Calming" that explains all the different methods that can be used for traffic calming, the regulations that apply and recommendations for use. It can easily be found on the internet.

+ Transport for London are investigating a number of cases of the registration of luxury or sports cars as "minicabs", i.e. private hire vehicles. These do not pay the Congestion Charge as they are exempt. Registration costs only £109 per year.

+ Britain's cities have the slowest moving traffic in Europe according to a survey published by traffic information service Keepmoving.co.uk based on satellite tracking. London was slowest with an average speed of 11.8 mph well ahead of the next worst which is Berlin on 15.0 mph. Paris for example is 19.8 mph and Rome is 18.7 mph.

+ Six million penalty charge notices were issued in London last year – most of them for parking offences. Only 56,000 were challenged by an appeal to PATAS with 38,500 being judged as incorrect. Edmund King of the RAC Foundation said: "Suggesting London's councils were getting PCN issuing right because 99% go unchallenged is absolute rubbish". He said the RAC received many calls from motorists who do not appeal despite having potentially valid claims of unfairness because of the time it takes and the risk of losing the discount for prompt payment.

+ Islington Council (who incidentally have also proposed a 20 mph speed limit for the whole borough) have introduced yet another "green gesture policy". Residents who give up their parking permit can claim a £100 voucher to be spent on a cycle, or on a car sharing club membership. As it probably costs at least that to run a car for a week, it hardly seems a worthwhile incentive, and I suspect that only people who are just about to move house out of the borough will claim it. But surely councillors have foreseen that?

Contact Information

This Newsletter is published by the Bromley Borough Roads Action Group (B.B.R.A.G.), PO Box 62, Chislehurst, Kent, BR7 5YB. All material contained herein is Copyright of B.B.R.A.G. 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 B.B.R.A.G.

B.B.R.A.G. Chairman and Newsletter Editor: Roger Lawson (Tel: 020-8467-2686, fax: 020-8295-0378, Email: roger.lawson@btclick.com). Contact the above for information on the aims and objectives of B.B.R.A.G. or for membership information (membership costs £12.00 per annum for individuals, or £9.00 if you opt to receive our Newsletter via email, or £50 for corporate membership). B.B.R.A.G. would be happy to advise or assist anyone who is concerned about any traffic, transport or road safety issues in the borough.

Our internet web address is: <http://www.bromleytransport.org.uk>. This contains much useful information including articles extracted from our newsletters. It also contains a "News" page which is updated regularly with items of topical interest.

Where this Newsletter is supplied in electronic form (e.g. as a PDF file via email), then you are permitted to pass it on to up to 5 additional readers without charge. In the case of corporate members, the Newsletter may be copied or forwarded to all staff members.

If you would prefer to receive this Newsletter in electronic form (via email as a PDF document which can be read by the free Adobe Acrobat reader), then please contact the Editor on the above email address. Apart from saving B.B.R.A.G. significant costs in printing and postage, you will gain a number of advantages such as seeing the pictures and diagrams in colour. The Adobe Acrobat reader can be downloaded from <http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat>

BBRAG Background Information

The Bromley Borough Roads Action Group (B.B.R.A.G.) stands for a more democratic and more rational approach to the traffic management problems of the London Borough of Bromley. Our initial formation some years ago was based on opposition to the kind of traffic calming scheme that was being introduced in the borough that simply caused more traffic congestion, and general inconvenience to road users, without any significant benefit in terms of road accident reductions. In fact, the money wasted on such schemes could have been much better spent on actual improvements to road safety in other areas. We now take a more general interest in all transport and associated environmental issues in the borough of Bromley and the greater London area. This includes traffic management schemes, public transport, road safety, parking policies, air pollution, other transport environmental issues such as noise, and associated local and central government policies. Our prime objective is to promote improvements in the transport infrastructure while stopping wasted expenditure on unpopular, ineffective or inappropriate policies.