
Drivers Against Daytime Running Lights – UK

Kevin Howe Chief Executive
MG ROVER GROUP LIMITED
PO BOX 41
LONGBRIDGE
B31 2TB

12th October 2003

Dear Mr. Howe,

Daytime Running Lights (DRL)

It is pleasing to observe that MG Rover Group continue to avoid using DRL to promote their vehicles.

In support of your policy, please may I lodge with you a copy of the 95 page research document by Perlot and Prower 2003 (also available from www.lightsout.org) which proves that previous research used to claim DRL have a benefit uses flawed data. I list an extract from the conclusion:

Review of the evidence for motorcycle and motorcar daytime lights

In conclusion, the formal evidence of the monitoring studies of the effect of both motorcycle and motorcar daytime lights fails to establish satisfactorily that daytime lights have had any overall effect to reduce accidents. The methods that the studies have employed are inherently flawed: the odds-ratio method is not specific to the effect of daytime lights, and the fleet study method is incapable of distinguishing between the immediate novelty effect of daytime lights, and their enduring true effect. The prima facie arguments in favour of motorcar daytime lights in turn fail to rescue the studies. On the positive side of the balance, the effect of daytime lights to reduce accidents is likely to be trivial. On the negative side there are important potential adverse side-effects.

As you may know the year on year decline in UK road accidents has stopped (please see www.safespeed.org.uk), in particular accidents to pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists are increasing. The City of London has reported a particularly sharp increase in accidents to these groups. Nationally, this is due to the government's misguided policy of persecuting rather than educating drivers and improving the road network.

We believe a contributory factor is the increase in DRL usage which affects the hazard perception abilities of other drivers and that DRL are promoted by certain irresponsible manufacturers as a marketing gimmick.

We have drawn their Chief Executive's attention to the risk personal liability if an accident attributable to headlight glare occurs (ref: letters posted on our website www.dadrl.org.uk)

May we offer our thanks and hope that attached report Perlot and Prower 2003 is of some assistance to your policy of not using DRL. We wish MG Rover group growing prosperity.

Yours faithfully,

Roy Milnes UK Co-ordinator DADRL Drivers Against Daytime Running Lights
www.dadrl.org.uk
www.lightsout.org

Karl Willcox **Directors Correspondance Advisor**
Rover Cars
Rover Customer Services
PO box 47
Cowley
Oxford
OX4 5NL

1 February 2000

Dear Mr. Willcox,

Daytime Running Light's

I am most grateful for you positive and helpful response of 28th January regarding DRL's.

Your experts may be aware of the various DRL studies including the last one which was the 175 page SWOV report by Kornstra, Bijleveld, Hagenzieker document ref. R-97-36.

We believe this is the basis used by the EU to grant type approval for DRL's, however we now have a document indicating that some of this research is flawed.

As supporting evidence to our concerns about the dangers to less conspicuous more vulnerable road users, I enclose a copy of a report prepared by our technical expert Stephen Prower of the British Motorcycle Federation titled Thirty Years on: Do motorcar daytime lights reduce accidents?

The conclusion is that DRL's do not reduce accidents and there is no conclusive evidence in their favour. We are in regular correspondence with the DETR Neil Bowerman, Lord Whitty, Gwynenth Dunwoody MP and Paul Manning who all have influence on road safety matters and this will be issued shortly.

I hope this document is of assistance to Rover Cars and BMW, may I thank you for your kind attention. I wish you every success with the new range of Rover Cars.

Yours sincerely,

Roy Milnes UK co-ordinator Drivers Against Daytime Running Lights