

# Critique of The Cambridge Access and Capacity Study (the Study)

Martin Cassini<sup>1</sup>

## Summary

The Study says it aims to tackle congestion and improve access. But it is clear from the outset that it is on a mission to restrict or ban cars, and improve access only for walking, cycling and buses. The Study amounts to a charter against choice and independent travel. In its bias, it breaches its stated aims of 'fairness and equity' (point 6).

There is nothing in the Study about improving the lot of motorists, only measures *against* them, as if they were not road-users too, simply trying like everyone else to get from A to B with the minimum inconvenience and delay.

The 2004 Traffic Management Act ([TMA](#)) places a statutory duty on Traffic Authorities (TAs) to explore all options for improving road safety, efficiency and air quality. Despite its call for 'radical interventions', the Study fails to mention progressive solutions, above all, low-speed, deregulated streets designed for equality and a social context. Nor does it consider a future with electric and non-polluting hydrogen fuel cell cars.

The statutory duty does not entail a ban on car use or ownership. So in its unrelenting attack on one set of legitimate road-users, the Study may be illegal. It is certainly undemocratic and discriminatory.

- Peak Congestion Control Points (PCCP) are to be implemented without consultation, through an Experimental Traffic Order (ETO).
- A Workplace Parking Levy (WPL) is touted as a revenue source to part-fund the scheme.
- Increased Parking Controls (including Residents' Parking) will catch motorists who try to avoid the WPL.

In the Appendix on page 12, there are links to articles about deregulated streets which have solved the issues the Study raises. In this critique, we refer to them as Equality Streets, shared space, low-speed environments, or the deregulated, design approach.

## Analysis of the Study

Point 3. In seeking better infrastructure for cyclists, walkers and public transport – the 3 – the Study ignores the fact that drivers are legitimate road-users too. It contrives a 'Them and Us' dichotomy, dividing users into clashing interest groups. It favours the 3 at the expense of that great invention, the motor vehicle, which enables independent travel. Given an equality-based level playing-field, which the Study neglects, all road-users could filter sociably, instead of being forced by the anti-social priority system to compete for gaps and green time.

---

<sup>1</sup> Martin Cassini is a video producer and campaigner for traffic system reform. He advocates replacing priority with equality to provide a level playing-field on which all road-users can act sociably. He lived in Cambridge from 1994-2003.

In its executive summary, the Study states that, to achieve the objectives in paragraphs 8 to 13, 'it is essential that congestion and delay are addressed', yet in the entire document, the role of traffic lights (and bus lanes) in causing congestion is ignored.

In all my observation and experience, whenever traffic lights are out of action, congestion disappears. I used to think traffic lights were badly timed, but at the Catholic Church junction in Cambridge in 2000, I realised they were unnecessary *per se*. Normally it took three entire signal changes to cross from Gonville Place to Lensfield Road. On this occasion, the junction was deserted. As I sailed through without incident or delay, I realised the lights were out of action. As soon as the lights were 'working' again, the jams were back.

Despite ample evidence that self-control is over twice as efficient and at least as safe as traffic control (discussed later), and despite my vigorous lobbying for a lights-off trial, Cambridge proceeded in 2013 with a £900,000 traffic signal 'upgrade' at the very junction where I saw the light about traffic lights in 2000.

When lights were out of action across central London, in November 2008, and February 2009, never was it more agreeable to cycle in London. Free to go on opportunity, traffic dispersed freely. Cab drivers waved me on, smiling. Free of vexatious controls that demand attention and obedience, everyone acted sociably. It's ironic that when lights are out of action, the authorities tell us to exercise caution, which we do instinctively anyway, implying that when lights are 'working', we can revert to norms of neglect.

Why do we 'need' traffic lights? – to break the priority streams of traffic so others can cross. Thus is most traffic control a vain exercise in self-defeat. Instead of treating the cause of danger and inequality on the roads – priority – they treat only the fallout from the priority system. When an 'accident' happens, it's always our fault, never the system's. I put accidents in inverted commas because most accidents are not accidents. They are events contrived by the misguided rules and design of the road. By failing to address this aspect of congestion, the Study fails in its aim of 'radical interventions' (point 10). And in failing to present a comprehensive analysis, it fails to present a comprehensive range of solutions.

'It is essential that congestion and delay are addressed and that capacity in and around the City Centre for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users is increased', states the Study, making no apology for its bias against the motorist. Isn't it the TA's duty to ease congestion for everyone, and to pursue the common good? By promoting the interests of one set of road-users over others, and ignoring progressive and proven ideas, the Study is failing in its duty under the 2004 TMA.

In point 8 the Study says it wants to improve connectivity, but it excludes private transport. Point 9 states 'the agenda is to back sustainable modes'. Sustainable in this context seems to mean 'anything but private vehicles' rather than 'long life', yet it ignores the rise of clean electric and fuel-cell propulsion, and the vast potential in traffic system reform.

Point 10 states that 'the transport network will get worse if we do not ... manage congestion ... Radical interventions are needed to provide new transport capacity *and allow for rational decisions by car drivers to change their travel behaviour to more reliable and convenient alternatives.*' [My emphasis]

The car is unparalleled for convenience, for ferrying passengers and goods, for getting from A to B to C and back at times of one's own choosing. Why is travel time unreliable? Because traffic (mis)management blocks natural flow. The quick, inexpensive way to provide new capacity is to eliminate the delay caused by traffic control. Journey time was more than halved by scrapping lights in Portishead (more on this below). Put the other way, decommissioning traffic lights more than doubled the efficiency of the road network.

Moreover, the stop-start motion caused by signal control multiplies fuel use and emissions by a factor of up to 4<sup>2</sup>. Prashant Kumar of Surrey University says it's as much as 29 times, (see [Red Lights could be slowly killing you](#)).

Point 11 shows that everything in the Study is in the service of the anti-car agenda:

'The transport vision for Greater Cambridge is that it should be easy to get into, out of, and around Cambridge by public transport, by bike and on foot'

- implying that access should be difficult for drivers!

Again, point 13 states that the aim is to improve congestion for public transport.<sup>3</sup>

Point 14: Mott McDonald was paid to deliver its 'report with a specific focus on the *interventions* that will address access and capacity in and around the city' [my emphasis] – the approach is one of coercive control, targeted against a specific stakeholder – the driver.

Point 17. The call for evidence deals with effect rather than cause. At peak times, volume of traffic can be a drama, but volume + controls = crisis. The Equality Streets approach is sound, and is supported by evidence, but for various reasons, traffic authorities resist more extensive trials that could provide more extensive proof. Ironically, there are no liability issues. A TA could bag over traffic lights overnight and could not be sued. Road-users must take roads as they find them, and exercise caution.

Point 22. The Study gets ever more ridiculous as it ratchets up the interventions: 'the proposal to remove side road junctions on main roads is being considered [for] Milton Road and Histon Road'. No! The solution to many of our congestion and most of our road safety problems, which the Study fails so signally to discuss, is simple: all-way give-ways (or filter-in-turn), with equal rights and responsibilities for all. Video evidence for the transformational gains from this approach can be seen here: [Portishead](#) and [Poynton](#).

Point 23. All but one of the first seven points, which promise 'delivery' of improvements, are geared towards public transport users, cyclists and pedestrians. They exclude drivers.

Point 23.6 talks of smarter users using a smarter network, in the digital sense. Yet smart solutions in the original sense of the word are overlooked in ignorance or neglect of the progressive approach, and in its jaundiced view of car users. Point 24. Agreed criteria for

---

<sup>2</sup> See my article [No Idle Matter](#).

<sup>3</sup> Yet the bus operator in King's Lynn once told me he had to schedule extra buses because of the time lost at innumerable traffic lights.

evaluation include 'fairness'. In what way is discrimination against one set of road-users fair?

Point 26. 'Road space re-allocation to non-car modes' – is clearly biased against motorists; 'road-user charging' – no doubt this refers to 'car modes', so, again, prejudicial.

With the Workplace Parking Levy, the council proposes charging car users for parking on private property – yet a car may be the only viable means for getting to work. This is dealt with more fully in points 50-54 below.

Point 28. Better bus, pedestrian and cycling infrastructure, streetscape and public realm are to be welcomed, but why not include vehicles in the grand plan? Poynton (see Appendix) shows that streetscape redesign combined with deregulation brings universal benefits, including economic regeneration.

On-Street Parking Controls (including Residents' Parking) – when it comes to cars, all the Study's proposals involve additional restrictions, bans, controls and costs.

Point 29. The anti-car agenda continues: 'The package aims to provide reliable and seamless journeys for bus users, cyclists and pedestrians on key routes into the city.' There is nothing about providing the same for motorists. This is blatant discrimination.

There is certainly nothing secret about the city's anti-car, anti-choice agenda.<sup>4</sup> Despite simple solutions at hand, the Study proposes, among various other command and control measures, a billion-pound congestion charge (point 69).

Point 30: 'Peak Congestion Control Points in the ... peaks would reallocate road space ... prioritising buses, cyclists and pedestrians and restricting general vehicular traffic ... Improved streetscape and public realm would also be sought ... taking advantage of the opportunity that less demand from vehicles for road space ... would bring.' – The anti-car agenda is not only discriminatory, it is misinformed. Poynton shows it is not necessary to restrict traffic for considerate conduct among all modes to flourish. You just need to create a low-speed environment, with deregulated streets designed for equality and a social context.

Point 31. 'A Workplace Parking Levy (WPL) would tackle ... congestion by providing revenue funding for local transport ... [and] specific measures to address congestion.' – This is robbing Peter to pay Paul. The Study's bias means a narrow agenda, when it should be promoting the common good. On this basis alone, the Study is egregious.

Point 33. 'Improvements to traffic signals and control systems would assist in the management of the transport network, and allow greater priority to be given to pedestrians, cyclists and buses.' – Traffic signals are bad news not only for motorists, but pedestrians and cyclists too. Westminster City Council's 2011 safety audit shows that no less

---

<sup>4</sup> At a public meeting in Cambridge in the 90s, I buttonholed a councillor who nodded in agreement as I listed ways in which congestion in the city could be eased. 'All good ideas,' he said. Then why do you do nothing about it? Is there a secret agenda? 'Oh, we're quite open about it,' he said. 'We want to force people out of their cars.'

than 44% of personal injury accidents occurred at traffic lights (1,830 of 4,169). How many of the remainder were due to priority? Compiled in the context of priority, the stats don't tell us.

The Study does not take into account guidance from the DfT's [\*Manual for Streets\*](#), which advises traffic authorities not to deploy traffic control as a first resort. Lamentably, the Study's only recommendations for reducing congestion involve control, enforcement and restricted access. It should be advocating or at least discussing fewer controls and allowing road-users to live and let live on sociable streets designed for equality.

Point 34. The Congestion Reduction package would involve 'extended [bus] routes to more necklace villages/extended operating hours for services to take better account of the variable working patterns of people working in the city ... new express bus services from surrounding towns ...' – All this is overdue, but the Study doesn't square it with improved facilities for all road-users. In its entire focus there is an astounding imbalance and bias.

Point 36. 'Junction priority will continue to be developed for cyclists, pedestrians, and buses, including on radial routes and the Inner Ring Road'. Meanwhile, private vehicles will be held at red, causing stress and delay, and damaging air quality. Limits, bans and regulating cars out of legitimate existence is not only unfair and undemocratic, it is inefficient.

Bans and controls should be a last resort. The first resort should be to release road-users from the straitjacket of traffic control and see how things go. A flexible trial to demonstrate that we get on better when left to our own devices should be accompanied or preceded by a programme of re-education and culture change to replace priority ('Get out of my way!') with equality ('After you').

Point 39. Peak Congestion Control Points (PCCP). One can appreciate the desire to encourage alternative modes, but in discriminating against car users, by limiting or banning 'general vehicular traffic on key routes during the morning and evening peak periods' it is denying our democratic right to choose. There should be less stick and more carrot. In Japan, they have air-conditioned buses with delightful attendants.

The entire approach is autocratic, not democratic. What if it's raining, or passengers or goods need ferrying to multiple destinations? In myriad circumstances, the 3 modes which the Study supports – cycling, walking and public transport – will be unsuitable. The anti-car, anti-choice agenda is a charter for inconvenience. The proposed PCCPs deny freedom of movement. Most of the anti-car measures defy the spirit and letter of the 2004 TMA, which requires TAs to explore all options for improving congestion, safety and air quality.

The way to ease congestion is to remove controls, not expand them. It would be simple, and relatively inexpensive, to re-design roads and bring about the culture change which would stimulate traffic flow at gentle speeds, enabling traffic to disperse and all road-users to coexist in harmony. This is progress, unlike expensive command and control which spells regression.

Point 41. 'All of these options were tested as simple "full peak period closure" schemes, allowing no general traffic access through any of the potential new Peak Congestion Control Points in the peaks ... before final implementation, they will be refined to ensure they meet

the objectives of the City Deal and provide the *correct* balance of outcomes for all users.’ [my emphasis]. How does the Study define ‘correct’? In the true sense of the word, clearly it has no interest in an equitable ‘balance of outcomes’.

Balancing the needs of all road-users is a laudable aim, but the balance should be fair. Certainly, for far too long, the balance of power on roads has favoured the motorist. The rule of priority lets vehicles dominate the road and intimidate other users. As toddlers, we have to learn age-inappropriate road safety drill to survive on roads rendered lethal by priority.

But the Study is blind to the nature of priority, from which most evils on the road stem. It falls into the trap of seeing drivers as the enemy and thinking that the only course is to attack them. But given a culture of equality instead of priority, they could be fellow road-users. We would all take it more or less in turns, coexist in peace, and traffic would disperse freely.<sup>5</sup>

Point 42 discusses the modelling work behind the modal shift which the PCCPs aim to bring about. As stated, there are superior, proven alternatives.

The Laweiplein in Drachten in Holland was the first place where traffic engineer, Hans Monderman, removed traffic lights. Before removal, buses had priority. It took an average of 56 seconds to cross the junction. After removal, with no priority for any users, buses crossed in an average of 26 seconds. And there were no further ‘accidents’. In Portishead, after the lights were bagged over (they operated under the most sophisticated MOVA system), journey times fell by over half despite a return from back-street rat-runs and greater numbers using the now free-flowing main route. There were no incidents except for a low-speed minor shunt when a driver was distracted by a BBC crew filming the free-flowing junction!

Point 45 says there is ‘a pressing need to address current congestion’, and ‘an experimental approach is the best way ...’ but what about the successful experiments with deregulation and streetscape redesign in Drachten, Portishead and Poynton? The omission is stupefying.

Point 47 proposes testing ‘via an experimental Traffic Regulation Order’ (ETO). This is a costly exercise in itself – and a convenient way to bypass public consultation. Once granted, an ETO is tough to rescind. It has taken the market town of Totnes three years and two High Court hearings to scrap a much-hated ETO imposed on the town: [Totnes campaign](#).

Point 48. There is nothing wrong with the desire to cut city centre or ring road traffic by improving Park & Ride and bus services. But improvements in Park & Ride and buses should not be combined with denial of choice through restrictive practice and bias against private transport. Deregulation + streetscape redesign + culture change will transform congestion, road safety and quality of life, and accommodate all modes in harmony. That is what should be trialled first. It is the elegant, sustainable solution. It is also future-proof (truly sustainable), because it will still work when we are all driving non-polluting fuel-cell cars.

---

<sup>5</sup> When traffic lights failed across London in November 2007 and February 2008, courtesy thrived and congestion dissolved. At the time I lived in King’s Cross. I cycled through Holborn, Cambridge Circus, Piccadilly Circus. Never was it more agreeable to be in central London.

Points 50-54. Workplace Parking Levy. In principle, there is no inherent problem with this, but it should be a later or last resort. First try Equality Streets/Poynton/deregulation. If and when traffic volume re-emerges as a problem, then consider a WPL. Or think about a WPL to help fund the streetscape transformation that is part of the Equality Streets approach.

Oddly, the Study admits the WPL alone will have no effect on congestion (point 53). Relying on the WPL as a revenue stream to fund its plans might prove unsustainable if driving to work falls dramatically; as those numbers drop, so too will revenue.

Point 61. 'Implementation of the Peak Congestion Control Point options would initially be through the use of an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order for up to eighteen months. There would be no formal public consultation on the detail of proposals prior to implementation, as the formal public consultation would be undertaken during the experiment period, allowing people to judge and comment on the impacts directly.'

Imposing an ETO without public consultation, and to consult during the experimental period only, means a *fait accompli* without hearing or testing the alternatives. As stated, once an ETO is in force, it's doubly difficult to dislodge it. Before you know it, a permanent TO is established.

Point 62. 'Cities that have had the most obvious success in catering for new travel demand without gridlock are typically characterised by the ability of large numbers of people to travel on the public transport network or by bike or on foot more effectively and reliably than in a car. However, even in these places, congestion remains.' Untrue. Poynton demonstrates the success of the deregulated, design approach. There are no traffic lights, no bollards, railings or road markings. There is free on-street parking. There was no manipulation of transport modes, and no special treatment for public transport. Everyone gives way, even big lorries. See this minute-long [clip](#).

Point 63. This is sensible, but again, wielding the stick by strangling car use should not be resorted to before the Equality Streets/Poynton solution has been tried.

Point 67. The Study's buzzword is 'interventions' – it appears 26 times in 37 pages. There is, however, no mention of 'innovation'.

Why doesn't the Study include in its traffic calming toolbox something along the lines below? The first shot is an example of stencil art, shotblasted onto the road surface at modest cost. This example is outside a school in Long Ashton, Bristol. The second picture shows a *trompe-l'oeil*, painted on the road. The lion is painted; the woman is real. Such innovative thinking and design communicates to drivers that different behaviour is called for.



Point 68 states that numerous other approaches have been considered, including 365 in the Call for Evidence. Yet there is no mention of shared space, Poynton or Equality Streets.

Point 69 proceeds immediately to another interventionist, restrictive measure that will impose extra costs on motorists, and cost a small fortune to implement: congestion charging.<sup>6</sup>

Point 71. This is the first sign of empathy shown to the motorist: ‘A congestion charge ... would penalise people who might not have alternative choices to travelling by car in the congestion zone.’ – Yet this consideration does not inform the rest of the Study’s thinking.

Point 73 admits that despite the London congestion charge, average speeds have fallen. The galaxy of 24-hour traffic lights makes traffic stop and start *ad infinitum*, often for no reason. By contrast, in Poynton, scrapping lights and reducing carriageways has enabled the doubling of pavement widths, parking bays, and it has created a sense of place. The result? A transformation in quality of life and space, and a local economy revitalised. Before the change there were 22 empty commercial premises. Now there is a waiting list.

Point 74 proposes reallocating road space for buses. Poynton reallocates carriageway space for ‘living room’, and allows all modes to coexist. In Oxford, after years of lobbying, the Council re-designed Frideswide Square, ditching a mess of traffic lights so that pedestrians can assert their equal right to the road space. A friend reports a halving of journey time home.

Point 76. ‘Do-nothing’ is listed as an option (though not recommended) but nowhere is there a mention of deregulation combined with streetscape redesign, nowhere a mention of the success of Portishead and Poynton. This omission amounts to a breach of the 2004 TMA.

Points 80–81. Once the Study in its current form goes out for consultation, the die will be cast. It will be too late to amend it. The public will be asked to consider a defective ‘package’ which has failed to include ‘all options for improving congestion’.

Point 82. ‘It will provide the public and stakeholders with a full understanding of one side of the argument.’ No: it will not inform them of other (less expensive, more elegant) options.

Point 83. Considerable resources are going on this defective strategy. There is nothing inclusive about the package as it excludes motorists.

Point 89. The Study claims to have taken equality into account. However, it is clearly biased against the freedom to choose to travel by private vehicle.

Point 90. The Study repeatedly underlines the function of the WPL as a private cash cow to fund a public service. At the very least, this is undemocratic.

Points 94-95. As they stand, the public engagement programme and proposed trial amount to a sales drive to sell a biased package.

Point 96 says that the congestion reduction package ‘seeks to avoid interventions with unfair implications for residents of different areas and to avoid any social impacts’ while

---

<sup>6</sup> See my [Guardian article](#) which argues that the London Congestion Charge was premature because it was imposed before deregulation had been tried.

admitting ‘that much care will need to be taken in the design of the PCCP and WPL to ensure this is not realised.’ Given its clear bias against the motorist, it seems unlikely this could be avoided.

Point 98 claims that if the proposals go ahead, transport emissions will be reduced. However, if traffic were free to go on opportunity, emissions would fall by up to 75% ([No Idle Matter](#)).

Appendix A – listing measures for ‘tackling congestion’ – includes nothing about Equality Streets or deregulation to ease the restrictions that block traffic flow and put different road-users at odds with each other and their surroundings.

Appendix B – claims the Study’s approach is ‘sustainable’. Even if its bias towards public transport is sustainable, at what cost is that sustainability bought? Its approach is arguably anything but sustainable, and certainly not as sustainable as Equality Streets which in addition to being safe, sociable, civilised and flexible, requires no expensive, coercive interventions.

## **Conclusion**

Cambridge is at the cutting edge of science and technology but remains in the Dark Ages when it comes to managing traffic. The Study ignores the potential in human nature for cooperation and coexistence. It pursues measures that prevent natural flow, and denies infinite filtering opportunities and expressions of fellow feeling. It neglects ideas of shared space/ Equality Streets/ low-speed environments.

The Study aims to nurture the potential of high-tech business, etc, but improving connectivity will not be achieved by banning private vehicles. By contrast, the Equality Streets approach allows choice and freedom – more suitable and sustainable in a forward-thinking city.

Portishead and Poynton show that deregulation and design achieve what coercion never will: less congestion, equality and inclusivity, road safety, and compliance without resentment. The 3 modes this Study supports – public transport, cycle and walking – are fine when appropriate, but not much use in bad weather, or for multiple tasks and destinations. Denying freedom of movement and choice is a recipe for poorer quality of life.

Given responsibility and the freedom to interact, drivers respond with courtesy and common sense. This is not a utopian vision, but a reading of human psychology. Do our personalities really change when we get behind a wheel, or is it because we become subject to regulation that defies commonsense? Why should we stop at red when no-one is using the green, when the junction is empty and it is clearly safe to go?

You’d cause a riot if you jumped a cashpoint queue, yet on the road we accept such anti-social behaviour without question. If we’re on a main road, licensed to ‘own’ the road, do we even notice the mother with a toddler in a buggy at the roadside waiting to cross, the toddler at the ideal level to inhale toxic fumes that will damage his or her brain development and lung function? It’s the system of priority which licenses such neglect.

If we lived by equality instead of lived and died by priority, we would not need the vast array of traffic controls that cost lives and cost the earth. Instead of being seen as the enemy, drivers would become part of the mix, interacting with other road-users on a level playing-field. Free from vexatious micromanagement, they would rediscover their humanity and make common cause. These are the principles that should guide us.

To transform congestion, quality of life and space, it is not necessary to reduce traffic volume. Traffic (mis)management itself – the elephant on the road that the Study ignores – is a primary cause of congestion. Throughput of vehicles is the traffic manager's spurious imperative. They have been getting things wrong for decades. 25,000 human beings, many of them children, killed or seriously hurt on our roads every year is hardly a cause for complacency, or a justification for repeating past and current mistakes.

Reform of the system is scandalously overdue. The regressive proposals in this Study are the problem, not the solution.

The great irony is that vast sums are spent on traffic control, most of which, as we have seen, is worse than useless; it is counterproductive. If TAs adopted the progressive approach, they could do away with their expensive systems and re-use the money saved by turning junctions into all-way give-ways, and making roads fit for people. Road-users would be able to get on with their lives without interference. Initially, the money saved would fund a transformation of the public realm, but after a while, with things running like clockwork under the supreme steam of human intelligence, and without the need for expensive maintenance and upgrades of traffic control equipment, councils would start seeing huge savings.

Streetscape redesign should be preceded or accompanied by re-education and culture change.

If and when congestion became a problem *after* deregulation plus redesign plus re-education had been tried, then, and only then, would it be fair to consider measures such as the PCCP and WPL. To impose them *before* the freedom package is tried is grossly premature.

## Appendix

Equality Streets: [www.equalitystreets.com](http://www.equalitystreets.com)

Poynton (article):

[www.equalitystreets.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/CE48-Poynton-Intro-HPH-v1.pdf](http://www.equalitystreets.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/CE48-Poynton-Intro-HPH-v1.pdf)

Poynton (video): [www.youtube.com/watch?v=-vzDDMzq7d0&feature=youtu.be](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-vzDDMzq7d0&feature=youtu.be)

Poynton clip (crossing without looking): [www.youtube.com/watch?v=mL6qd5rqCyg](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mL6qd5rqCyg)

Portishead (article):

[www.equalitystreets.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/TEC-Award-truth-final.pdf](http://www.equalitystreets.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/TEC-Award-truth-final.pdf)

Portishead (video): [www.youtube.com/watch?v=vi0meiActIU](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vi0meiActIU)

Efficiency savings:

[www.northdevonjournal.co.uk/billions-saved-removing-traffic-lights/story-26266968-detail/story.html](http://www.northdevonjournal.co.uk/billions-saved-removing-traffic-lights/story-26266968-detail/story.html)

2004 TMA (Traffic Management Act):

[www.gov.uk/government/publications/traffic-management-act-2004-summary/traffic-management-act-2004-summary](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/traffic-management-act-2004-summary/traffic-management-act-2004-summary)

*No Idle Matter*: [www.trafficechnologytoday.com/features.php?BlogID=718](http://www.trafficechnologytoday.com/features.php?BlogID=718)

*Red Lights could be slowly killing you*:

[theconversation.com/stopping-at-red-lights-could-be-slowly-killing-you-37195](http://theconversation.com/stopping-at-red-lights-could-be-slowly-killing-you-37195)

*Manual for Streets*:

[www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/341513/pdfmanforstreets.pdf](http://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/341513/pdfmanforstreets.pdf)

Totnes campaign: [www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-devon-36083358](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-devon-36083358)

Congestion charging (Guardian article):

[www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2008/sep/21/congestioncharging.london](http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2008/sep/21/congestioncharging.london)